

Duplicate

THE UNITED EMPIRE LOYALISTS

By REV. W. O. RAYMOND, M.A.

1. — *Introductory.*

A master hand truly is that which must some day attempt to write from a non-partisan stand-point the history of the American Revolution—an event destined to leave a lasting impression on the future history of the American continent.

Of the Revolutionary struggle, a greater variety of opinion has been expressed and vastly more been written than of any other event in the entire history of America.

The subject has been reviewed from almost every possible stand-point, and he is a keen student of history who has read a tithe of the volumes dealing with the question which are to be found in the public libraries of the United States and Canada. 'Of making many books there is no end!' Nevertheless, the further the impartial reader pursues his researches in this well-trodden field, the more likely is he to arrive at the conclusion that the true history of the American Revolution has not yet been written.

This need not be a matter of surprise. The event is itself comparatively a matter of yesterday. Many of the leading actors have passed from the scene within the memories of those yet living. Old prejudices yet blind the vision and warp the better judgment of the would be impartial historian.

An instance of the truth of the last statement is to be found in Sabine's work, 'The Loyalists of the American Revolution.' The author, in the pages of his book, has placed on record the results attained during twenty-five years of patient research. His indefatigable labors have brought to light facts of great interest which might otherwise have been irrecoverably lost. But Sabine's book loses much of its interest for the Canadian

reader, and much of its value as a historic work, from the fact that the information has been largely gleaned from sources strongly anti-British. (See list of authorities, page v., edition of A. D. 1864.) The information bearing on the lives of leading Loyalists is in some instances inaccurate. This is excusable and might naturally be expected. In other cases, however, combined with inaccuracy, will be found all the unfairness and even bitterness of a partisan writer. The student who has pursued independent investigation is forced to the conclusion that Colonel Sabine wrote, whether consciously or unconsciously, rather as a citizen of the great republic than as an impartial historian.

Hitherto the great bulk of what has been written concerning the American Revolution has been the work of United States writers.

Nearly every New England town of any importance has its local historian, who, with scarce an exception, records the events of the Revolutionary war from an *ex parte* stand point, enlarging upon the virtues and heroism of the 'Patriots,' and pointing the finger of scorn at the 'Tory.'

From such sources the youth of the neighboring republic have for generations imbibed a strongly anti-British sentiment. Even in their school books there is the most extravagant glorification of the deeds of their forefathers, and a corresponding depreciation of their enemies. For over one hundred years the fourth of July has been celebrated with the booming of cannon and all the outward display that impresses the youthful mind, the rising generation always carefully instructed by the orator of the day to preserve the principles of their fathers, to cherish

1893 M.P.M. 2

hatred of monarchy, and enmity towards Great Britain.

So much for the sentiment inspired by the every day history of the United States.

Whilst in Canada the events of the Revolutionary epoch have been viewed from a very different standpoint, we can hardly claim that it has been with us the standpoint of strict impartiality.

The prejudices entertained by the Loyalists against their old antagonists were very pronounced—not unnaturally so. They had received in many instances the harshest kind of treatment. They had lost their all by the event of the war. They had been obliged to sacrifice comfortable homes and all the endearments associated with their early years, to settle in an unknown wilderness where toil and privation awaited them. And lastly there was the natural bitterness arising out of the consciousness of a lost cause. Need it be a matter of surprise that the Loyalist should be disposed to record a version of the Revolution somewhat at variance with that generally received by the citizens of the United States?

The truth is that the events of this period have only of late years been calmly and temperately considered by the descendants of either party.

Both the United States and Canada have been making history since then. Our neighbors in the great republic have learned by experience, and in a way never to be forgotten, that 'loyalty' may be a virtue, the supporters of 'the powers that be' may be worthy of honor, the upholders of a united nation may be true patriots. Throughout the dreadful fratricidal strife, the rallying cry of the North was, 'The Union must and shall be preserved!' and preserved it was, though at the cost of millions of money and half a million lives. The war of the Revolution is no longer the only one in which the prowess of their nation has been conspicuously shown.

With the lapse of years the intense bitterness that once prevailed is pass-

ing away. Friendly intercourse promoted by the facilities of modern travelling has brought about a better understanding between the two English speaking peoples of the continent. Both are beginning to realize with greater appreciation the tie of blood and the bond of a common mother-tongue, and to cherish with equal affection the common heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race in the traditions of the past whence has been handed down to either people a common Christianity and kindred institutions and laws.

Nothing, perhaps, so remarkably shows the altered sentiment generally entertained regarding the events of the American Revolution as the desire now manifested by either party to learn the opinions and investigate the records of those who wrote from the opposite standpoint. The historical societies of the United States gladly welcome to their shelves all documents and records which give a description of the stirring events of Revolutionary times, even though written by the 'ultra-Tory.' Eventually the historian will be greatly aided in his task by comparing and contrasting the statements made by the respective partisans. The account of the Royalist, compared with the like account of the Revolutionist, may suggest the happy medium which shall most nearly approximate the sober truth.

2—*Causes of the Revolution.*

It is impossible in the limits of such an article as this to do more than indicate the leading causes of the war between the colonies and the mother country. That the colonies had serious grievances is undeniable: that they showed a proper amount of forbearance under strong provocation is at least a debatable question.

To understand the state of parties at the breaking out of the war, reference must be made to a few points of early history.

The year 1620 was rendered memorable in New England by the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth.

Eight years later, John Endicot established a settlement at Salem. The next colony, under Winthrop, settled in Massachusetts Bay in 1630. The Puritan element in New England at the outset was supreme, and it continued to control public affairs of the old colony for years.

The Puritans were undeniably a most self-denying and conscientious class of people. The sacrifices made and the privations patiently endured by them challenge our admiration. Nevertheless, they were intolerant and narrow minded. In his history of New England, Neal, the Puritan historian, admits:

It must be allowed that when the Puritans were in power they carried their resentments too far.

Dr. E. E. Beardsley, of New Haven, in a recent historical work says:

When men talk of the sufferings and sacrifices and self denial of the Puritans, they should consider the spirit and principles of the age, and remember how those who were thus persecuted turned persecutors and practiced the rigors from which they sought to escape.

That eccentric clergyman, Dr. Samuel Peters, in his exaggerated and sensational history of Connecticut, makes the sweeping assertion:

The proceedings of the ecclesiastical courts were marked with much severity. In the course of 160 years, they have bored the tongues with hot needles, cut off the ears, branded on the forehead, and banished, imprisoned and hanged more Quakers, Ranters, Episcopalians, for what they call heresy, blasphemy and witchcraft, than there are instances of persecution in Fox's book of martyrdom.

The Puritan prejudices against the established church of England were exceedingly strong, and their prejudices against monarchy scarcely less so.

They warmly sympathized with the republican party in England, and welcomed the establishment of the Commonwealth, notwithstanding the rather curious fact that it was under Cromwell, in 1651, that the famous Navigation Act was passed, which, a century later, became a leading factor among the causes of the American Revolution.

Early in the reign of Charles II.,

a resolute effort was made to apprehend Whally and Goffe, two of the judges of Charles I., who had fled to New England for protection. The provincial governor, Puritan clergy and the people united in protecting and screening the fugitives, who by their aid eventually baffled all attempts to secure them.

The seeds of rebellion were thus sown in the early New England settlements and nurtured through their history. The spirit of 'independency' found its origin in the principles of the Puritan exiles, whose passion for religious freedom combined with innate dislike of monarchy created a longing for civil independence.

The preponderating power of Puritanism made itself felt throughout New England, but it was the aggressive Puritan faction of Massachusetts Bay which was mainly responsible for the hostility that grew up by degrees against the mother country. The Pilgrim fathers of Plymouth were as a rule tolerant, nonpersecuting and loyal to the king; but the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay were intolerant persecutors of all religionists who did not conform to their mode of worship* and disloyal from the beginning to the government from which they held their charter. We need not be surprised, therefore, that it was in the 'old Bay State' that the Revolution had its origin.

In Virginia and the South the Episcopalians were much divided by the war, Washington and many prominent leaders of the American party being members of that church; but in New England and the Middle States, the Episcopalians and their clergy were, as a rule, loyal to the crown. This latter fact is quite consistent with the antipathy existing between the Church of England and the old Puritan party. John Adams wrote, 'If parliament could tax us they could establish the Church of

* Dr. Ryerson (*Loyalists of America*, vol. 1.) shows by unquestionable evidence that the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay were professed members of the Church of England when they came to America.

England, with all its creeds, articles, tests, ceremonies and titles, and prohibit all other churches as conventicles and schism-shops.' The writings of Samuel Adams abound in like expressions.

The proposition of sending out English bishops to the British Provinces, although designed solely for the benefit of the Episcopalians, whose members could not be confirmed or ministers ordained without crossing the Atlantic, aroused the hostility of the Puritans, who could not patiently contemplate the establishment among them of 'prelacy,' as they termed it. Puritan hostility to the Church of England was a not unimportant factor in the causes of the American Revolution.

In the eighteenth century, the great majority of English people knew little and cared less about the affairs of the colonists in America. Some idea may be gathered from the following words, written in England in December, 1776, by Curwen, a refugee, as to the way in which America was regarded by the average Englishman :

It piques my pride, I confess, to hear us called 'our colonies,' 'our plantations,' in such terms and with such airs as if our property and persons were absolutely theirs. like the villians and cottagers in the old system, so long since abolished, though the spirit or leaven is not totally gone, it seems. It is my earnest wish the despised Americans may convince these conceited islanders that our continent can furnish brave soldiers and expert and judicious commanders.

The ignorance and general indifference of the British public regarding America gave opportunity for selfish and interested parties to use parliament as a means to promote their own ends. Hence it came to pass that imperial legislation for years was entirely in the interests of the mercantile classes of England. Restrictions of the most harassing nature crippled the trade and enterprise of the growing colonies.

The distribution of public offices chiefly amongst those of English birth, to the neglect and exclusion of native talent, was a natural ground

of complaint. The denial of promotion to colonial officers of distinguished ability, and the injustice of placing a captain of the regular army as superior in rank to a colonel in the provincials, was a further source of irritation.

But in addition to these grievances which affected the pride and sensitiveness of the colonists, there were no less than twenty-nine laws* which restricted and bound down colonial industry. They forbade the use of water-falls, the erection of machinery, of looms and spindles, and the working of wood and iron. Colonial vessels were forbidden to engage in commerce, and could only trade with England and her possessions. For years these laws affecting trade were a dead letter; and the same might be said of the revenue laws, since, up to 1763, nine-tenths of all the tea, wine, fruit, sugar and molasses consumed in the American colonies was smuggled.

A financial crisis, brought about chiefly by the long French war, led the home government to take special steps to enforce the payment of duties on goods imported into the colonies. It was claimed, not without some show of reason, that the colonies should assist in defraying the cost of a war which had been fought mainly in their interests. When, however, twelve ships of war were sent to Boston to be employed in the revenue service, the merchants of the New England seaports immediately assumed a hostile attitude towards the ministry of Great Britain.

The intense interest in the matter manifested by the merchants and ship owners is indicated by the fact that one quarter of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were engaged in trade or commanded

* No one who has read these twenty-nine acts will recommend their perusal to another. Apart from their volume, the construction is difficult. Special students like Bancroft, Palfrey and Scott have failed in stating their effect with exactness and precision; and trained lawyers are not by any means agreed as to their interpretation.—*Justin Winsor.*

ships. Some of them were smugglers. John Hancock, the first signer of the Declaration, was at the outbreak of the war the defendant in suits brought by the crown to recover nearly \$500,000 of penalties for wilful infractions of the law.

The immediate and ostensible causes of the Revolution were the Stamp Act of 1765 and the tea duty of 1773; but these acts only brought to a climax the feud that had for years been brewing.

3.—*Political Parties.*

The political parties in the thirteen American provinces were designated respectively 'Whigs' and 'Tories,' although their sentiments and principles were not quite identical with those of the two great parties in the mother country. In the conflict, the Whigs very largely took sides with the advocates of American independence, whilst the 'Tories' as a rule proved loyal to the king.

A brief summary of the state of political parties in the thirteen colonies at the commencement of hostilities may here be given.

In Maine, the great body of the people were Whigs, although a large number of influential citizens sided with the crown.

The situation in New Hampshire was very similar to that in Maine; the Whigs being in a large majority, but with numerous and powerful opponents.

Massachusetts, the cradle of the Revolution, was much the most active and energetic of all the colonies in the war; yet even here the people did not embrace the popular side in a mass. Upwards of 1,100 persons retired with the Royal army at the evacuation of Boston; and an equal number either previously or subsequently embarked from the different ports of Massachusetts and sought new homes under the old flag.

In Rhode Island and Connecticut the Loyalist element was much stronger than than elsewhere in New

England. Such towns as Stamford, Norwalk, Fairfield, Stratford and Newton probably contained a majority well affected to the crown, and they were styled 'Tory' towns.

New York was undeniably the stronghold of the Loyalists, and contained more of them than any other colony in America. This is indicated by the fact that whole battalions and even regiments were enrolled on the side of the king during the war; whilst for the cause of independence New York only contributed 17,781 troops, as compared with 67,907 furnished by Massachusetts.

New Jersey—termed 'a scion from New York'—contained also a large number of Tories. Dr. Ramsay states that when the first conflict of arms took place in that province, 'scarce one of the inhabitants joined the Americans while numbers were daily flocking to the Royal army to make their peace and obtain protection.' New Jersey contributed at the close of the war large numbers of expatriated Loyalists, who found a home in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

The sentiment of Pennsylvania was very diverse in its character. The religious faith of many of its people was opposed to armed insurrection. The Loyalists were influential and wealthy, and by no means inconsiderable in numbers. It was claimed that had Sir William Howe issued a proclamation when in Philadelphia, 3,500 men would have repaired to his standard. The prominent Whigs are said to have exhibited timidity and indecision.

Passing now to glance for a moment at the state of affairs in the Southern Provinces, we find that Delaware and Maryland did not take a very active part in the Revolution.

Virginia contained a strong loyal element, as is shown by the correspondence between Washington and Col. Joseph Reed. Early in March, 1776, the latter wrote that there was 'a strange reluctance in the minds of many to cut the knot which ties us to Great Britain, particularly in this colony [Pennsylvania] and to the

southward.' A few days later he wrote :

The Virginians are so alarmed with the idea of independence, that they have sent Braxton on purpose to turn the vote of that colony, if any question on that subject should come before Congress.

Washington, replying to Col. Reed, wrote that the people of Virginia 'from their steady attachment heretofore to royalty, will come reluctantly into the idea of Independence.'

In North Carolina, the Whigs and Tories were divided in fairly equal proportions. During the war a large number of Loyalists joined the Royal party and enlisted under the king's banner. Many of the Whigs were, says Sabine, 'as unstable as the wind.' The troops furnished for the Continental army during the war numbered 7,268, or less than one third of the quota required of the state.

South Carolina, up to the time of the Revolution, had modelled its local government and institutions after the pattern of England. It was in fact a sort of monarchy in miniature. The hot blooded Southerner has ever proved a violent partizan: probably in none of the thirteen provinces was the internecine strife waged with as much bitterness as in South Carolina. During the war, General Greene wrote :

The Whigs seemed determined to extirpate the Tories and the Tories the Whigs. Some thousands have fallen in this way in this quarter, and the evil rages with more violence than ever. If a stop cannot be put to these massacres, the country will be depopulated.

Thirty battles were fought within the limits of South Carolina; and after all the Tories were not subjugated, but, on the other hand, after the fall of Charleston and until the peace, were in the ascendant.

Georgia, the remaining province, may be said to have been in its infancy. It had, however, a considerable number of Loyalists, and seems to have been so doubtful a source of strength to the cause of independence that a proposal was made in 1781 to separate Georgia from the union.

When South Carolina and Georgia were abandoned by the British, in 1782, there were 13,271 Loyalists to accompany the troops.

Chief Justice Marshall, in his life of Washington, says :

The people of the South felt all the miseries which are inflicted by war in its most savage form. Being almost equally divided between the two contending parties, reciprocal injuries had gradually sharpened their resentments against each other, and had armed neighbor against neighbor, until it had become a war of extermination. As the parties alternately triumphed, opportunities were alternately given for the exercise of their vindictive passions.

Sabine, referring to this unhappy period in the South, says :

It were a hard task to determine which party perpetrated the greatest barbarities; and whatever the guilt of the Tories, the Whigs disgraced their cause and the American name.

Whilst there have been widely differing estimates of the proportion of the Loyalists to the entire population of the old colonies at the beginning and during the progress of the war, enough has been written to prove that the American Revolution was much more of a civil war than has been generally admitted by United States writers. At the beginning of the struggle there were three classes of people in the colonies: a large and energetic minority, which aimed at the separation of the colonies from England; a smaller, yet influential minority, which desired above all else to perpetuate the unity of the empire; and a class larger than either, which stood in an attitude of expectancy. As the war progressed, the last named class found itself obliged, in some cases with the greatest reluctance, to side with one or other of the parties first mentioned.

John Adams affirmed that only a third of the American people were averse to the Revolution. Lecky, the English historian, says 'It is probably below the truth that a full half of the more honorable and respected Americans were either openly or secretly hostile to the Revolution.' Careful study and in-

vestigation, on the part of the writer have only served to confirm the opinion expressed by the historian just named, that the American Revolution was the work of an energetic and persevering minority, which succeeded in committing an undecided and fluctuating majority to a cause for which, at the outset, they had but little love, but which subsequently the force of circumstances led then to support with more or less heartiness. Col. Sabine says that whilst the Loyalists almost always claimed that they were really in the majority, his own opinion is that they certainly fell short of a majority, though making a large minority.

4.—Character of the Loyalists

It would be idle to contend that in their adherence to the crown *all* the Loyalists were influenced by the highest motives. The age in which they lived and suffered was not particularly noted for conduct that was disinterested and virtuous. In the name of historic accuracy, we venture to protest against the assumption too often made regarding the degeneracy of our own age compared with the past. Any one who reads such descriptions of New England society as are to be found in Bartlett's life of Rev. Jacob Bailey must be convinced that the past century has brought about a material improvement, both in the decencies of society and in public morals. Nevertheless, the general character of the Loyalists stands high—their opponents themselves being the judges.

In the concluding chapter of his historical essay, Sabine gives the character of the Whigs under the following heads:

Principles of unbelief prevalent—The Whigs lose sight of their original purpose and propose conquests—Decline of public spirit—Avarice, rapacity, traffic with the enemy—Gambling, speculation, idleness, dissipation and extravagance—Want of patriotism—Recruits for the army demand enormous bounty—Shameless desertions and immoralities—Commissions in the army to men destitute of principle—Court-martials frequent and many officers cashiered—Resignations

upon discreditable prettexts and alarmingly prevalent—The public mind fickle—Disastrous changes in Congress.

All these points are elaborated by Sabine, and supported by documentary evidence, amongst which is the following extract from one of Washington's letters:

From what I have seen, heard, and in part know, I should in one word say that idleness, dissipation and extravagance seem to have laid fast hold of most; that speculation, peculation and an insatiable thirst for riches seem to have got the better of every other consideration and almost every order of men: and that party disputes and personal quarrels are the great business of the day.

In other letters Washington laments the laxity of public morals and the many melancholy proofs of the decay of private virtue.

The bounty paid to soldiers by Congress was as high as \$750 and \$1000. A thousand men, the date of whose enlistment had been misplaced, perjured themselves in a body as fast as they could be sworn, in order to quit the ranks they had voluntarily entered. Many more enlisted, deserted, and re-enlisted under new recruiting officers, for the purpose of receiving double bounty.

'In a word' says Sabine, 'I fear that whippings, drummings from the service, and even military executions, were more frequent in the Revolution than at any subsequent period of our history.' John Adams wrote, in 1777:

I am weary to death with the wrangles between military officers, high and low. They quarrel like cats and dogs. They worry one another like mastiffs, scrambling for rank and pay like monkeys for nuts.

Sabine closes his powerful arraignment of the Whigs as follows:

Such, rapidly told, is the dark story of the Revolution as concerns the winners. I relate it for several reasons: first, because it is due to the losers in the strife; second, to show that there were wicked 'Whigs,' as well as wicked 'Tories'; third, to do something to correct the exaggerated and gloomy views which are often taken of the degenerate spirit of the present times, founded on an erroneous, because on a partial estimate of the virtues of a by-gone age.

The bitterness of the contending

parties was seen in the words and acts of the leaders. For instance, we find John Adams, writing from Amsterdam, Dec. 15. 1780, lamenting that the executive officers had been 'too timid in a point which I so strenuously recommended at the first, viz., to fine, imprison and hang all inimical to the cause, without fear, favor, or affection.' He adds, 'I would have hanged my own brother, had he taken part with our enemy in the contest.'

Even Washington, in writing to his brother, in March, 1776, seems to express satisfaction that the Tories of Massachusetts were not suffered to remain in the country; and in another letter, referring to the exiled Loyalists that had departed with the British army for Halifax when Howe abandoned Boston, he says:

By all accounts there never existed a more miserable set of beings than these wretched creatures now are. One or two of them have done what a great number ought to have done long ago—committed suicide.

When leaders like Washington and Adams, who in succession occupied the presidential chair, could use such language, the violence of the 'Sons of Liberty' need not be a matter of surprise. Indeed it seems to have been the design of the leaders of the movement to imbue the popular mind with animosity against the king and all his loyal subjects. As time went on, the incendiary speeches of Samuel Adams, Philip Henry and John Adams, aided by the efforts of zealous co-workers, began to effect the popular mind. Clever writers such as James Otis, Josiah Quincy, Lee and Jefferson, scattered their pamphlets through the length and breadth of the country, by specious arguments paving the way for an appeal to the sword. The most notable production amongst the literature of the period was a pamphlet entitled 'Common Sense,' written by Tom Paine at the suggestion of Franklin and others. Its publication immediately after the skirmish at Lexington ensured a favorable reception. It was everywhere sought

after and eagerly read. The American press and all the historians of the time speak of the electric and marvellous influence of Paine's tirade against monarchy, against England, and in favor of independency.

Dr. Chas. Inglis, rector of Trinity Church, New York, and others, replied, but rather ineffectively, to 'Common Sense.*' In a letter written October 31, 1776, Dr. Inglis, speaking of Paine's essay, said:—

It was one of the most virulent, artful and pernicious pamphlets I ever met with, and perhaps the wit of man could not devise one better calculated to do mischief. It seduced thousands. At the risk of my liberty, and even my life, I drew up an answer and had it printed here; but the answer was no sooner advertized than the whole impression was seized by the Sons of Liberty and burned. I sent a copy to Philadelphia, where it was printed.

The character of Tom Paine, even at this time, was infamous beyond a doubt, as was proved in a discussion a few years since in the columns of the New York Observer in which he is termed 'a blasphemous infidel and beastly drunkard.' The Observer further quotes with approval from the London Athenæum:

A more despicable man than Tom Paine cannot be found among the ready writers of the eighteenth century. He sold himself to the highest bidder, and he could be bought at a very low price.

The following interesting incident is recorded by Mr. E. F. de Lancey in his notes to Jones Loyalist History of New York during the Revolutionary war:

'What book have you got hold of, William?' was the question Chief Justice John Jay put to his young kinsman, Wm. H. DeLancey,† as he found the latter intently reading in his library.

'Botta's history of the American Revolution,' was the reply.

'The history of the American Revolution,' said the Judge. 'Well,

*Dr. Inglis was afterwards the first bishop of Nova Scotia. One of the few existing copies of his pamphlet is in the possession of Jonas Howe, Esq., of St. John, N. B.

†William H. DeLancey, at this time a young clergyman, subsequently became first Bishop of Western New York.

Botta's is the last, and perhaps the best; but let me tell you, William, the *true* history of the American Revolution can *never* be written. A great many people in those times were not at all what they seemed, nor what they are generally believed to have been.

This conversation took place in 1821; and it may be looked upon as a calm statement made in the evening of his days, beneath his own roof and to his own relative, by a man who, perhaps, next to Washington, knew most thoroughly the facts and the men of the Revolutionary era.

Without making any extravagant claim with respect to the virtues of the Loyalists, it may be fearlessly asserted that, as a class, their honesty of purpose and integrity of character stood high. In such particulars as intelligence, education, religion, and steadfast adherence to the cause they conscientiously believed to be right, those who espoused the king's cause will bear a more than favorable comparison with their opponents.

Among those most honest and fearless in their avowal of loyalty to the crown were men of the noblest character and highest position. In New England, the Episcopal clergy were very steadfast in their fidelity to the king. There was also a large loyal element in the humbler walks of life. It was found alike in the farmers of New England, the Quakers of Pennsylvania and the blacks of South Carolina and Georgia.

Those who occupied official positions at the beginning of the struggle naturally took the side of authority and regarded themselves as justified in standing for the ancient order of things and resisting change. They asserted that the Whig leaders were needy office hunters. Subsequently their indignation was intensified as they found their places filled by men of inferior social position, possessed of less wealth and education, and wanting in refinement of manners. To recall the words of James Allen, a Pennsylvania Loyalist:

The Revolution filled the Assembly

with a wretched set, and brought all the dregs to the top.

In these days we can afford to regard with a little quiet amusement the indignation which filled the breasts of the old office bearers as they beheld their positions filled by 'upstarts.' Nevertheless these same old Loyalists, despite their antiquated ideas of prerogative, etc., were in general men of upright character, steadfast in adherence to the principles in which they believed, and willing to make great sacrifices for the preservation of a united British empire.

5.—*Loyalist Principles.*

It has been affirmed that the difference between the two parties in the colonies at the commencement of the struggle with the mother country was simply this—the Whigs were willing to remain colonists provided their grievances were redressed and their rights secured; while the Tories were contented thus to continue without such security.* This is the assumption of nearly all American writers; but it is an assumption unfair to the Loyalists, and not warranted in point of fact.

The truly loyal subjects of the king—those who acted from the highest motives, and eventually sacrificed their all in an effort to maintain the integrity of the empire—were as keenly sensitive to the injustice of the government of the day in its dealings with American subjects as were those of their countrymen who took up arms; but their warm attachment to the mother country enabled them more temperately to view the situation. They were not unmindful of the benefits derived from British protection in the past. They had not yet forgotten the great conflict waged with France on behalf of the colonies. They believed that the English nation would yet be aroused to a sense of its duty, and that a solution of the problem might be attained by constitutional means.

Holding such views as these, the

* Sabine.

Loyalists heartily participated in the first Congress at Philadelphia, held in September, 1774. Their sentiments are very well expressed by Judge Thomas Jones, himself a Loyalist, in these words:

A redress of grievances, and a firm union between Great Britain and America upon constitutional principles, was their only aim. This they hoped for, this they wished for, this they expected. To this purport they also verbally instructed the delegates. These sanguine hopes were frustrated by the artful cabals of the republicans in Congress, and they wished for and so much desired reconciliation blasted by a hasty, ill-judged and precipitate adoption by Congress of a set of resolves made at a town meeting in the county of Suffolk in the province of Massachusetts, which contained in almost express terms a declaration of war against Great Britain.

The sentiment of opposition to the oppressive measures of the British ministry, if not absolutely unanimous, was substantially so at this time throughout the provinces. We have the positive avowals of Washington, Franklin and John Adams, that up to the assembling of Congress the vast majority of the people had not thought of independence or of seeking anything beyond a peaceful redress of grievances. This point is further established by the instructions given by the various provinces to their delegates in the first Congress. Massachusetts, which contained the largest republican element of any, bade her delegates deliberate and determine upon wise and proper measures to be by them recommended to all the colonies, for the recovery and establishment of their just rights, civil and religious, and the restoration of union and harmony between Great Britain and the colonies, most ardently desired by all good men.

It was not, however, the intention of such men as Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Hancock, Gadsden, Lee, John Adams and Jefferson to rest content with the moderate line of action suggested by those whose ideas they were supposed to represent. They pursued a shrewd yet cautious policy, which, aided by opportune provocations brought about by the obstinacy and stupidity

of the king and his ministers, at length led to an open rupture.

The president of the Massachusetts Historical Society,* in a thoughtful article on the American Revolution, admits this. He says:

Congress was generally in advance of its constituency. It knew how to temporize and to give intervals of pause in steadily working on to its ultimate declaration Instead of any healing of the breach, the whole activity of Congress extended to widen it. A regret was expressed in some quarters that by the connivance and consent of the royal governors and through the legislative processes a more legal and conservative character had not been secured to this meeting of delegates—as it dangerous plotting might thereby have been averted. But the patriot leaders of the movement were too well advised to look for any such official co-operation. . . . The whole method of the steady strengthening of the spirit of alienation from Great Britain was a *working of popular feeling* in channels different from those of ordinary official direction and oversight.

The conduct of those Loyalist who supported the remonstrances of the first Congress touching the grievances of the colonies but who afterwards strongly opposed the dismemberment of the empire, has been very unfairly represented by Sabine and other American writers.

Take the case of Joseph Galloway, of Philadelphia, as representative of others.

He was a lawyer of great abilities, a man of wealth and of high social position. He had made many strong protests against the oppressive measures of the English government. He was a member of the Pennsylvania assembly for eighteen years, and twelve years its speaker. At the Congress of 1774 he represented his native province, the delegates of which were strictly charged to avoid everything indecent and disrespectful to the mother state. Being a man of keen discernment, he soon perceived the general tendency of Congress; consequently, when chosen a delegate to the second Congress he positively declined to serve, although importuned to do so by Dr. Franklin. The instructions given to the Pennsylvania delegates

* Geo. E. Ellis, D. D., LL. D.

at the second Congress contained the stringent words, 'We strictly enjoin you that you, in behalf of this colony, dissent from and utterly reject any proposition—should any such be made—that may cause or lead to a separation from the mother country, or a change of the form of government.'

In a letter addressed to Dr. Franklin about this time, Galloway gives his reasons for refusing to be again a delegate. The general tenor of the letter may be gathered from the following passage:

A certain sect of people, if I may judge from all their late conduct, seem to look on this as a favorable opportunity of establishing their republican principles and of throwing off all connection with the mother country. I have reason to think that they are forming a private union among themselves from one end of the continent to the other.

With any scheme looking to the dismemberment of the empire, Joseph Galloway had no sympathy whatever; and he accordingly speedily disassociated himself from those with whom he had heretofore acted. Is his conduct in so doing to be stigmatized as that of a traitor? Is it not rather the only line of conduct he could follow consistent with his principles? He had joined heart and hand with those who professed to be seeking only a redress of grievances by constitutional means. He had found the course pursued by the extreme Whigs to be marked by insincerity and duplicity—that outward professions of loyalty but thinly veiled the spirit of rebellion.

A pamphlet from the pen of Galloway was printed in London in 1780. In it, after commenting severely upon the injustice of Great Britain, he goes on to argue that the rebellion did not spring from a dread of being enslaved. The movement in favor of independence was the natural outcome of the republican ideas cherished by the Puritans. He deemed it not unreasonable that the colonies, having now attained a good degree of prosperity, with a population more than a quarter that of Great Britain, should contribute to the support of a

government that had fostered their infancy, espoused their quarrels, and at enormous cost defended them. He defines the policies of the two parties in America—the one looking towards the securing of just claims with a redress of grievances on the basis of a solid constitutional union with England, and opposed to sedition and all acts of violence—the other resolved by all means, even though covert and fraudulent, to throw off allegiance, appeal to arms, run the venture of anarchy, and assert and if possible attain independence. The latter party, acting with some temporary reserve and caution, opposed all peaceable propositions and covertly worked for their own ends, till finally the mask was thrown off, and the casting vote of the 'timid and variable Mr. Dickinson' carried the Declaration of Independence.

Some additional light as regards the line of conduct followed by leading Loyalists is afforded in the published life of Peter Van Shaack, LL. D., embracing selections from his correspondence and other writings during the Revolution. Van Shaack was educated at Kings (now Columbia) college, New York. He attained distinction as a lawyer, and gained the friendship of such men as John Jay, R. R. Livingstone and Theodore Sedgwick—a friendship not broken by the events of the Revolution.

Van Shaack acted in complete accord with those who—whilst contending that the measures of the British ministry were arbitrary, oppressive and unjust, and should be opposed and resisted by remonstrance, petition and all legitimate means—were strongly against proceeding to armed rebellion. He firmly held to the opinion that an unbroken connection with the mother country was essential to the prosperity of the colonies, and that a civil war would result in anarchy. He spoke and acted with the Whigs till the crisis arrived and recourse was had to arms. Then he withstood such extreme action and sought to maintain a position of quiet neutrality in his native village. This,

The United Empire Loyalists.

however, was not allowed him. He was summoned before the committee on conspiracies, and ordered to take an oath asserting the independence of his State. Refusing to comply with this demand, he was forced to seek an asylum in England.

Another old document of interest in this connection is the diary of James Allen, Esq., of Philadelphia. Here is an extract:

When Gen. Howe was expected in Philadelphia, a persecution of Tories (under which name is included every one disinclined to independence, though ever so warm a friend to constitutional liberty and the old cause) began.

The writer of the diary was one of the four sons of Chief Justice William Allen, of Pennsylvania. The members of the Allen family, without exception, sympathized strongly with those who joined in protesting against the oppressive measures of the king and his ministers. They participated in all the early efforts for a redress of grievances; but when the question of dismemberment of the empire arose all the brothers withdrew from their former associates. One of them raised a corps of Pennsylvania Loyalists, which he commanded till the close of the war, when he came to St. John, N. B., and was a grantee of that city in 1783. The diarist, James Allen, whilst avowing his real sentiments, sought by prudence to protect him self from harsh treatment; which, however, he found he could not avert. He died during the war. (September, 1778). The three remaining brothers were each attainted of treason, and lost their estates under the confiscation acts.

The examples mentioned will suffice to emphasize the fact that the Loyalists as a class were not the unhesitating supporters of the home government in its unjustifiable treatment of the American colonies.

To sum up what has been said regarding the attitude of the Loyalists at the commencement of hostilities, we first of all note that the sentiment of opposition to the oppressive measures of the British ministry was almost unanimous throughout the colonies. The Loyalists were *not*

reconciled to the endurance of the situation as then existing; but they believed the attainment of redress to be possible in the near future without the alternative of a bloody civil war. They had able and influential friends in the mother country. Should the present ministry continue obdurate, there was every probability that their successors would do justice to America. Meanwhile they were content to possess their souls in patience, making use of every legitimate and constitutional means to obtain redress.

Referring to the Declaration of Independence, an American writer says:

Candor admits that a very large number of honorable Loyalists had at this crisis to meet a bitter disappointment. They had heartily sent a representation to Congress for the purpose of securing a redress of grievances; but that Congress had proved, as was claimed, treacherous to its proposed objects, and had led them into a trap and had abused their confidence.*

The Declaration of Independence was a severe blow, not to the Loyalists only, but to the best friends of America in England. Men like Chatham, Camden, Richmond, Burke, Fox and Cavendish had warmly espoused and nobly vindicated the cause of the colonies. They had, on the authority of Franklin and others, insisted that Congress earnestly desired to retain British connection at all hazard. When, therefore, Congress voted to renounce all past professions of such a desire, declaring the mother country their enemy and avowing a final separation, the surprise of Chatham and his friends was intense. They could not but feel that their confidence had been betrayed and their patriotic efforts frustrated.

There has been a good deal of speculation in the minds of the students of the history of America as to the probability of the continued union of the colonies with Great Britain had Pitt held the helm of state in the troublous times preceding the Revolution. The question

* Dr. Ellis, in *Narrative and Critical History of America*.

will always be a debatable one. We may believe, however, that had Pitt been in power, American independence would not have come when it did, nor would it have been eventually brought about by means of a disastrous civil war.

6.—Persecution of Loyalists.

The position of the Loyalists after the Declaration of Independence was indeed a painful one.

History in times of civil discord always proves the impracticability of neutrality. Those of the Loyalists who desired at the outset to be conservators of peace, and who made some effort for the preservation of order and the rights of property, were denounced as enemies of liberty and finally compelled in self defence to claim the protection of the royal army rather than take the oath of allegiance to Congress and fight against their king.

Probably a large portion of the people of America would gladly have remained neutral; but the Declaration of Independence left no neutrals. He who opposed independence became *ipso facto* 'an enemy of liberty.' Thus by the action of Congress at Philadelphia, July 4th, 1776, thousands of peace-loving citizens were classed as 'enemies,' 'rebels,' and even 'traitors,' because they declined to renounce allegiance to the mother land and swear allegiance to a new and self-created authority, relinquishing their privileges as British subjects at the command of republican leaders whom they neither liked nor trusted.

In the early stages of the Revolution, the Loyalists suffered greatly at the hands of organized mobs which, under the designation of 'Sons of Liberty,' dealt in the harshest way with all suspected of entertaining sentiments favorable to the crown. Private proceedings were devised to ascertain the opinions of any regarded as doubtful supporters of independency. The prominent Tories were called on to recant and swear allegiance to Congress. Failing to

secure the desired recantation, there followed in order, disarming, confinement to residence or to certain limits, fines, imprisonment, banishment and in many instances gross personal injury and even marderos violence.

The use of tar and feathers, Sabine remarks, was 'so frequent as to qualify the saying of the ancient, that man is a two-legged animal *without* feathers.' The mob sometimes varied this punishment by *smoking* the Tories,—the victims in that case being confined in a close room before an open fire of green wood, with a cover applied to the top of the chimney. Still another alternative was the cruel and shameful practice of riding Tories on a rail.

To give a tithe of the recorded instances of the brutality of the New England mobs would far transcend the limits of this paper. The details of many of the outrages will be found in such books as Jones' Loyalist History of New York, Sabine's Loyalists of the American Revolution, Ryerson's Loyalists of America and their Times, Peters' History of Connecticut, Bartlett's Frontier Missionary, etc.

A long list of pamphlets and other published writings might be given wherein individuals have recorded the pitiful tale of sufferings which they experienced at the hands of old time friends and neighbors. Little surprise need be manifested at the strong partisan feeling that runs through the pages penned by men who sacrificed so much and suffered so severely. The opinions of these old Loyalists were very pronounced, and their estimate of the general character and conduct of the 'rebels' by no means flattering. The counterpart will be found in the records of the actors on the other side, whose opinion of the 'Tories' is well known. Whilst, however, the *opinions* of these old Loyalists must be taken *cum grano salis*, there is every reason to believe that the facts recorded by them are substantially accurate. The subsequent history of the writers in the land of their adoption furnishes the most satis-

The United Empire Loyalists.

factory evidence of their integrity of character, and inspires confidence in their credibility.

In no way can we acquire so vivid an idea of the brutality of the New England mobs as by reading the personal experience of some of the sufferers as related by themselves. The experience of Jacob Bailey in Maine, of Thomas Jones in New York, of James Moody in New Jersey, and of John Connolly in Pennsylvania, are only fair samples of the bitter trials endured by their compatriots. Mention may also be made of the hardships endured by the missionaries of the Church of England who were laboring at numerous points in all the colonies, from Maine to Georgia. Their reports transmitted to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts are filled with striking pictures of the horrors of civil war.

The cruelty and injustice of the mobs, select-men, Sons of Liberty and like organizations in the early days of the Revolution greatly contributed to the subsequent bitterness and animosity of the conflict, and no doubt added largely to the number of the Loyalists who took up arms and fought through the war on the royal side.

Take the case of Silas Raymond, of Norwalk, Conn., as an example of what was a very common experience. His sympathy was with the mother country and he was averse to the idea of independence. Having the courage to express his opinions, he speedily aroused the animosity of the select-men. They threatened his life, and two attempts were actually made to shoot him as he was engaged in reaping wheat in his field in the autumn of 1776. He was obliged to join the British garrison at Lloyd's Neck, Long Island, distant some twenty miles across the Sound. His real estate was ordered to be leased out for the use and benefit of the state, and his goods and effects confiscated by order of the authorities, in December, 1777. The confiscation papers allege as the ground of action that 'the said Ray-

mond has put and continued to hold and screen himself under the protection of the ministerial army.'

Take again the case of Walter Bates, of Stamford, Conn. He writes:

'The British fortified Lloyd's Neck with a garrison, opposite the islands and coves lying between the churches of Norwalk and Stamford, whose inhabitants were wealthy farmers—Churchmen and Quakers—all loyalists, which afforded a complete asylum and safe passage, by which my three brothers and hundreds of others passed by night almost continually to the British garrison.

At length the thing I greatly feared came upon me. A small boat was discovered by the American guard, in one of these coves, by night, in which they suspected that one of my brothers, with some others, had come from the British. They supposed them concealed in the neighborhood and that I must be acquainted with it.

At this time I had just entered my sixteenth year. I was taken and confined in the Guard House; next day examined before a Committee and threatened with sundry deaths if I did not confess what I knew not of. They threatened among other things to confine me at low water and let the tide drown me if I did not expose these honest farmers. At length I was sent back to the Guard House until ten o'clock at night, when I was taken out by an armed mob, conveyed through the field gate one mile from the town to back Creek, then having been stripped my body was exposed to the mosquitoes, my hands and feet confined to a tree near the Salt Marsh, in which situation for two hours time every drop of blood would be drawn from my body; when soon after two of the committee said that if I would tell them all I knew, they would release me, if not they would leave me to these men who perhaps would kill me.

I told them that I knew nothing that would save my life.

They left me, and the Guard came to me and said they were ordered to give me, if I did not confess, one hundred stripes, and if that did not kill me I would be exchanged. Twenty stripes was then executed with severity, after which they sent me again to the Guard House. No 'Tory' was allowed to speak to me, but I was insulted and abused by all.

The next day the committee proposed many means to extort a confession from me, the most terrifying was that of confining me to a log on the carriage in the saw mill and let the saw cut me in two if I did not expose those Tories. Finally they sentenced me to appear before Col. Davenport, in order that he should send me to headquarters, where all the Tories

he sent were surely hanged. Accordingly next day I was brought before Davenport—one of the descendants of the old apostate Davenport, who fled from old England—who, after he had examined me, said with great severity of countenance, I think you could have exposed those Tories.'

I said to him 'You might rather think I would have exposed my own father sooner than suffer what I have suffered.' Upon which the old judge could not help acknowledging that he never knew any one who had withstood more without exposing confederates, and he finally discharged me the third day. It was a grievous misfortune to be in such a situation, but the fear of God animated me not to fear man. My resolution compelled mine enemies to show their pity that I had been so causelessly afflicted, and my life was spared. I was, however, obliged to seek refuge from the malice of my persecutors in the mountains and forests until their frenzy might be somewhat abated.

After two years' absence, on my return home, I found my father down with the small-pox, suspected to be given him by design, consequently the family were all in inoculation, which I also had to endure, after which I could not by any means think of leaving my father until I had assisted him in his wheat harvest.

The first night after I was summoned with a draft for the Continental Service with three days' notice, consequently was compelled to flee for refuge, I knew not where, but providentially found myself next morning in the immediate neighborhood of a British garrison.

After the Declaration of Independence, the new state authorities claimed the right to enforce against all Royalists severe punishments—confiscation of property, imprisonment, banishment, and even death. In Massachusetts, a person *suspected* of enmity to the cause of independence could be arrested and banished, unless he would swear allegiance to the friends of liberty. Three hundred and eighty persons were designated by name, who had fled from their homes: the penalty of their return was fixed as imprisonment and transportation to a place possessed by the British, and for a second return without leave, *death* without benefit of clergy. In Rhode Island, death and confiscation of estate were the penalties provided for any person who communicated with the British ministry or its

agents, or who offered supplies to the British forces and to the armed ships of the king. The offence of enlisting or procuring others to enlist in the royal army or navy was punished with loss of estate and of personal liberty not exceeding three years. The laws enacted by the other states were similar. Forfeiture of estate, confiscation of property, loss of personal liberty, and even death were the penalties Loyalists were subjected to for adhering to the cause in which they believed. In New York alone, sixty Loyalists of note are mentioned by name in the Confiscation Act, which decreed that 'each and every of them who shall at any time hereafter be found in any part of this state shall be and are hereby declared guilty of death as in case of felony without benefit of clergy.' The proscribed list includes the names of Beverley Robinson, George Duncan Ludlow, Gabriel Ludlow, Christopher Billop, James DeLancey, Robert Bayard, Dr. Charles Inglis and others prominent in the early history of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The estates of all these Loyalists were confiscated. That of James DeLancey was sold by the state for \$234,198.75, and that of Frederick Phillipse, another of the attainted sixty, was valued in 1809 at above £600,000. The names of Susannah Robinson, Margaret Inglis, and Mary Morris, (wives respectively of Col. Beverley Robinson, Dr. Charles Inglis and Col. Roger Morris,) were included in those 'forever banished from this state.' They were placed among the sixty, says Judge Jones, because they were possessed of large and valuable real estate in their own right; the vindictive legislature of New York, in order to get possession of these estates, attainted the women for adhering to the enemies of the state—that is to say, for living with the husbands! Their children, many of them mere infants, were thus debarred from inheriting the estates of their mothers.

Like penalties might be imposed on all who could by a summary trial

be proved guilty of treason. The 9th section of the Confiscation Act states what overt acts shall be deemed evidence of high treason, viz.

Voluntarily withdrawing to any place within the power or possession of the King of Great Britain, his fleets or armies; or being apprehended by order of provincial congress, or committees thereof, or councils of public safety of this State.

John Adams, 'the colossus' of the congress of 1776, which gave to the world the Declaration of Independence, in that very declaration affirmed that 'all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness,' yet in almost the same breath he 'strenuously recommended to fine, imprison and hang all inimical to the cause, without favor or affection.' The Revolutionary party learned all too well the lesson instilled into their minds by their leaders.

Early in the contest, great bitterness was excited; and wherever the two parties were nearly equal the internecine strife assumed all the horrors of a civil war. It is as easy as it is unfair for United States local historians to record, with some exaggeration of detail, the outrages which were committed during the conflict by certain of the Loyalists, and to ignore like acts on the part of the Whigs.

It should be remembered that the Loyalists who were victims of outrages at the hands of mobs, Sons of Liberty, etc., would naturally carry ever after a keen remembrance of their sufferings, and be disposed to retaliate whenever fitting opportunity presented itself. Here is a case in point.

William Frost, a Loyalist, of Stamford, Conn., after suffering the usual persecutions at the hands of the selectmen of his native town, fled for refuge to the British garrison at Lloyd's Neck. The 'rebels' of Stamford were in most instances attendants at the Rev. Dr. Mather's services, the doctor himself being a pronounced advocate of American

independence. On the night of July 21st, 1781, Capt. Frost, at the head of an armed party, crossed the Sound in seven boats, and the following day (Sunday) surprised and carried off Dr. Mather and forty-eight prominent 'leaders of sedition.' They were brought within the lines of the garrison at Lloyd's Neck, where they found many of their old neighbors whom the war had now changed into bitter enemies. Doubtless Frost's exploit was a brilliant success from the British standpoint, but the Stamford local historian views it as a 'sacrilegious foray,' and enlarges in detail on the subsequent sufferings of Dr. Mather and his flock. But why omit the account of the cruel treatment experienced by their neighbor, Rev. Dr. Leaning, who was confined in jail as a Tory, and even died a bed? His treatment caused him disease, and rendered him a cripple for life. Dr. Mather's prison was probably not a whit worse than some which were occupied by the Loyalists, as witness the following:

Under the convention chamber in which the New York provincial congress met in 1777, were jail rooms in which were confined the Loyalists who had been arrested by the committee appointed to inquire into and detect conspiracies. This prison was so full, and the prisoners neglected and in such a horrid state, that the convention, on motion of Governor Morris, passed the following resolution:

Whereas, From the past want of care in the prisoners now confined in the jail immediately underneath the Convention Chamber, the same is supposed to have become unwholesome, and very nauseous and disagreeable effluvia arises, which may endanger the health of the members of the Convention;

Therefore Resolved, That for the preservation of their health, the members of the convention be at liberty at their pleasure to smoke in the Convention Chamber, while the House is sitting and proceeding to business.

(Governor Morris, who moved the resolution, was not a smoker.) Shortly afterwards, the jail became so crowded that a prison fleet was established, which in turn became so

over-crowded as to be no fit abode for the worst of criminals. These prison ships were eventually burned, to prevent their capture by the British. Judge Jones states:

There were at this time about 150 Loyalists on board, and confined below decks in irons. The rebel crews got on shore, but they never released the poor prisoners, who all perished in the flames.

7.—Loyalists in Arms.

In the Canadian archives for the year 1883, p. 11, the names of twenty-nine Loyalist corps are recorded. At the close of the Revolution many of the disbanded officers and men of these corps settled on the river St. John and elsewhere in the province of New Brunswick. The list referred to need not be given in full: such names as King's Rangers, Queen's Rangers, King's American Regiment, Prince of Wales American Volunteers, Royal Fencibles, etc., are both strikingly familiar to the ear and suggestive as well of the loyalty of those who chose such patriotic titles for their regiments.

Some account of the doings of the Provincial corps will be found in the Haldimand papers at Ottawa, the papers of Sir Guy Carleton in the war office, London; Stryker's New Jersey Volunteers; Jones's Loyalist History of New York; DePeyster's Military Career of Brig. Gen. Johnson; of the King's Royal Regiment; Simcoe's Operations of the Queen's Rangers; the narrative of Lieut. James Moody; the diary of Lieut. Anthony Allaire; Fanning's narrative of Adventures in North and South Carolina, and Sabine's Loyalists of the American Revolution.

New England furnished several regiments—the Loyal New Englanders, Wentworth's Volunteers, and other corps—which, however, were more noted as marauders than on the field of battle.

In the South there were many ardent supporters of the loyal side. In the Carolinas a Royalist regiment was raised in a few days in 1776, and again in 1779. The most ob-

noxious of all the Tory vagabondish leaders,' says Justin Winsor, 'was Colonel David Fanning, of North Carolina, whose narrative, giving an account of his adventures in North Carolina from 1775 to 1783, has twice been printed (Richmond, 1861, New York, 1865)*'

In Georgia and Carolina, the bitterest partizan warfare was carried on between the Whig and Tory bands. This is very well illustrated in Fanning's narrative. Writing from St. John, in March, 1786, to the commissioners on the Loyalist claims, he sums up his services by saying he was engaged against the rebels thirty-six times in North Carolina and four times in South Carolina. He commanded armed parties varying in strength from a hundred to nine hundred and fifty men. He was twice wounded, and many times a prisoner. On one occasion he captured and carried off the governor of North Carolina. So exceedingly obnoxious did he become that he was declared an outlaw, and was one of three excepted by name in the act of general pardon and oblivion passed by the state.

New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania supplied the larger and better organized portion of the loyal corps, which in the field gained an enviable reputation for steadiness and courage. DeLancey's battalions particularly distinguished themselves in the campaign in the southern colonies. The Queen's Rangers was a regiment second to none in the British service. Butler's corps achieved notoriety through their action in what is called the 'massacre of Wyoming,' concerning which there has been much controversy.

* Colonel David Fanning has not received fair treatment, either at the hands of Sabine or of those who published his narrative 1861 and 1865. He came to New Brunswick at the close of the war, and settled on the St. John river, at the head of 'the Mistake' in the parish of Greenwich, Kings Co. His name is preserved in Fanning's Creek, a small stream in the neighborhood. He subsequently removed to Digby, N. S., where he died in 1825, aged 70 years.

The strictures of American writers have, however, been ably traversed by Dr. Ryerson.

It is but natural that very opposite opinions should have been formed by the contending parties regarding the acts of their enemies. As an example of this we find that whilst DeLancey's battalions were commended for their bravery and general conduct by the commander-in-chief of the British forces, they were in such ill odor with the Stamford 'patriots' that they passed a resolution that 'none of the unprincipled wretches who belong to the most infamous banditti called DeLancey's corps should return to their homes in Connecticut.'

It is unnecessary to particularize the services of the Provincial regiments during the seven years of conflict. Suffice it to say that as a rule the loyal corps behaved with 'reputation, credit, honor and courage,' despite the fact that they met with comparatively little encouragement from the 'regulars,' who looked upon them as an inferior class of soldiery, neglected the advice of Provincial officers, and pursued a European mode of warfare unsuited to the country.

The British generals made a great mistake at the beginning of the war in not exerting themselves to gain the sympathy and support of the entire loyal population of America. Instead of doing so, they appear to have viewed the matter with indifference, and to have permitted the rank and file of the army to rob and plunder the inhabitants without discrimination, thereby alienating those most warmly disposed to favor the cause of the mother country. The misfortunes of the Loyalists were thus greatly aggravated by the fact that they were exposed to harsh treatment not only by avowed enemies, but by professed friends.

Says the Rev. Leonard Cutting, in a letter written at Hempstead, Long Island, in 1781:

Where the army is, oppression, such as in England you can have no conception of, universally prevails. We have noth-

ing we can call our own; and the door to redress is inaccessible. The army has done more essential injury to the king's cause than the utmost efforts of his enemies.

The same reckless indifference to the interests of the Loyalists prevailed in the navy. This is proved by the following petition:

To His Excellency, James Robertson, Esquire, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Province of New York and Lieutenant General of His Majesty's Forces, etc., etc., etc.,

The Memorial of John Fowler, Israel Hoyt, and David Pickett, most humbly sheweth:

That having left their properties in the country and come within the Royal Lines for protection, upon application to Government for support they obtained with others a grant of Eaton's Neck, the property of John Sloss Hobart, in Rebellion, but the same being applied for and obtained by James Jauncey, Esquire, and others, who had a mortgage on the same, your memorialists hired the same from those gentlemen at a Rental agreed on.

That being settled on said place upon the aforesaid terms, and endeavoring to support their families by honest industry, they found themselves disappointed, and prevented enjoying the fruits of their labors by the crews of the armed vessels stationed in Huntington Bay for their protection, who have taken their property from them without any license, pay or satisfaction.

That they have made repeated application to the commanders of said Guard Ships to prevent the ravages of their crews and to obtain satisfaction, but obtaining neither, they, with their associates, applied to Admiral Digby for redress, who kindly wrote to said commanders on the subject, without producing the desired effect; that upon the delivery of Admiral Digby's letter to Captain Steel he flew into a violent passion, threatening to tie the complainants to a gun and flog them, ordering them out of the ship, and adding he would blow them to Hell if they ever came alongside again, telling them he would give them no redress nor protection, but would have his revenge before he left the station.

In this situation, being left remediless, they apply to your Excellency, as Governor of the Province, the Patron and Director of all Loyal subjects driven from their habitation, and humbly request that your Excellency would be favorably pleased to recommend their distressed case to His Excellency Admiral Digby, and to interpose in their favor, so that they with the others suffering in a similar situation may have effectual redress and a stop be

put to such ravages for the future; and they as in duty bound will ever pray, etc.
New York, 8th January, 1782.

Judge Jones, speaking of the soldiers quartered on Long Island, says:

They robbed, plundered and pillaged the inhabitants of everything they could lay their hands upon. It was no uncommon thing of an afternoon to see a farmer driving a flock of turkeys, geese, ducks or dung hill fowls and locking them up in his cellar for security during the night. The whole day it was necessary for a person to attend in the fields where they fed to protect them from the ravages of the military. It was no uncommon thing for a farmer his wife and children to sleep in one room, while his sheep were bleating in the room adjoining, his hogs grunting in the kitchen, and cocks crowing, hens cackling, ducks quacking and geese hissing in the cellar. Horned cattle were for safety locked up in barns, stables and outhouses. This robbing was done by people sent to America to protect Loyalists against the persecutions and depredations of rebels. To complain was needless: the officers shared in the plunder.

The inhabitants of Long Island were at this time nearly all of them favorable to the king's cause.

In passing through the Jerseys and Pennsylvania, the red-coats and Hessians seemed to find a wanton pleasure in entering houses and barnyards to outrage and pilfer, stealing the cattle and devastating the crops of the loyal inhabitants with as little compunction as if they had been rebels. Some of the victims had fortified themselves with protection papers obtained from British officials, testifying to their fidelity to the government, and even to their having done service for it; but it was in vain that these certificates were exhibited to rough marauders, who either could not or would not read them. Cases are even recorded in which rapine and violence were accompanied by vile debaucheries which drove many true hearted Loyalists to desperation.

There can be no doubt whatever that the haughty, arrogant demeanor of the British 'regulars' towards the 'provincials,' combined with the ill treatment of loyal inhabitants by English soldiers and sailors, lost to the royal cause thousands upon

thousands of friends and well-wishers in all the colonies. Nevertheless, as has been already shown, the number of those who actively supported the British side was very considerable. In December, 1780, there were 8,954 Provincial troops among the British forces in America, at which period the strength of the 'Continental army' was but little more than 21,000 men. In addition to the regularly enlisted Provincial troops, there were loyal 'associations' in Massachusetts, Maryland and Pennsylvania, 'associated Loyalists' in New York, and similar organizations in other states.

By all estimates, probably below the mark, 25,000 natives of the colonies were enrolled in the king's service at one time or another during the war.

8.—An Inglorious War and a Disgraceful Peace.

To conquer by force of arms a people of English blood, numbering between three and four millions, scattered along a seaboard of 1200 miles, was indeed a formidable task.

Upper Canada in the war of 1812, with the aid of a few hundred British troops, for three years baffled the forces of the United States, more than ten times their number, though their territories were separated by a river only. In the late American civil war the Southern States for four years withstood the resolute onslaught of 'the North,' waging so desperate a war that with the assistance of one of the great European powers, such as France, they would probably have gained their independence.

England's attempt to subdue the rebellion of 1776 was rendered more formidable by the difficulties of transportation. Had the Revolution been the rising *en masse* of the American people, it would soon have ended in the acknowledgment of their independence by the mother country. But it was far otherwise. The forces employed by England never exceeded 45,000 men, including the Provincial regiments; yet such was the half-

heartedness of the American people in the strife that England, frequently on the verge of success, failed mainly through the inactivity and incapacity of her generals.

The main army of the Americans under Washington was seldom even equal to that opposed to him. Indeed the practice of short enlistments, coupled with frequent desertions, at times reduced the forces of the Americans so greatly that their only safety lay in the ignorance of their enemies of the real state of affairs.

In the campaign of 1777, Gen. Howe's slowness and mismanagement surprised even his enemies. A French officer in the American service, M. du Portail, wrote to the secretary of the war department in France:

It is not the good conduct of the Americans that enabled them to make a campaign sufficiently fortunate; it is the fault of the English. If the English, instead of making so many diversions of a trifling nature had opposed Washington with 20,000 men, I do not well know what would have become of us. If the English had followed up the battle of Brandywine, Washington's army would have been spoken of no more. General Howe has in all his operations acted with such slowness and timidity as to strike me with astonishment. An active, enterprising general with 30,000 men must reduce this country.

In December, 1779, Washington complained that his forces were 'mouldering away daily,' and expressed his astonishment that Sir Henry Clinton could 'justify remaining inactive with a force so superior.' Lord North, with quaint humor, once said,

I do not know whether our generals will frighten the enemy, but I know they frighten me whenever I think of them

Some Americans have claimed that the hand of Providence was certainly with them in the contest; since on no other supposition is it possible to explain such incidents as Gage's prodigal expenditure of human life at Bunker Hill, Howe's repeated failure to profit by the weakness of his enemies or even to follow up his own successes, Clinton's inactivity at critical periods, Cornwallis's mis-

taken course in the Virginian campaign, and similar short-sightedness on the part of other commanders.

The ultimate failure of the British, however, was undoubtedly due to the aid afforded the revolted colonies, first by France, and subsequently by Spain and Holland.

It is not the purpose of this article to trace in detail the progress of the Revolutionary war, much less to consider its events from a military standpoint.

The surrender of Lord Cornwallis and his army to the combined French and American forces on the 19th October, 1781 was a fatal blow to the hopes hitherto entertained by the Loyalists of the final triumph of the British arms. The event produced a profound sensation both in England and America. It called forth the extremes of joy and sorrow. The situation is very well described by the Rev. T. Watson Smith in his interesting account of the Loyalists at Shelburne:

At Philadelphia, at midnight a watchman is said to have traversed the streets, shouting at intervals: "Past twelve o'clock and a fine morning. Cornwallis is taken!" It seemed as if the words would wake the very dead. Candles were lighted, windows were thrown up, figures in night robes and night caps bent eagerly out of the windows, and as half-clad citizens met each other in the streets they shouted, laughed, wept for very joy. In New York the effect was far otherwise. That city had been for five years an asylum for the friends of Britain from all the revolted colonies. During those years it had been gay with all the pomp and circumstance of war. To the vast crowd of Loyalists collected there, most of whom had hoped that absence from former homes would be but temporary, the surrender of Cornwallis seemed like the knell of doom—a doom all the more to be dreaded because undefined. The struggle had been long and severe. It had not been precisely a foreign war or a civil war, but in it had been combined the features of both. On the battle fields of the Revolution neighbor often met neighbor, and brother even sometimes met brother. There had been much, too, that was not war, but merely the gratification of a desire for plunder or a spirit of revenge under pretence of war.

The length of the contest and the spirit manifested by the victors when

their success was assured soon showed the Loyalists they had little to expect in the way of kindness at the hands of their adversaries. All they could depend upon was the favor of that country at whose call they had suffered the loss of all things, and it may be added that they did not appeal in vain.

The events of the American Revolution, however, redound neither to the honor of the ministry that controlled the management of England's public affairs nor of the commander-in-chief of her forces; but, alas, the national humiliation was not so great in the untoward events of the war itself as in the inglorious treaty of peace which terminated the war. It is almost a wonder that sufficient British territory was retained in America to provide a home for the exiled Loyalists!

The chief negotiator on the English side was one Richard Oswald, a retired Scotch merchant. He was selected by Lord Shelburne, the colonial secretary, and by him recommended to Benjamin Franklin as a 'pacific man, and conversant in those negotiations which are most interesting to mankind.' Franklin soon found Oswald most acceptable as a negotiator. The British cabinet unwisely thought it judicious to defer to Franklin's personal liking for Oswald, and intrusted the latter with ample authority to arrange as soon as possible the details of the treaty. Oswald was a weak man to pit against such an intellectual giant as Franklin. He was impressed with the idea that peace was absolutely necessary to England, he was ignorant of the country whose bounds were to be defined, and he was easily humbugged. The effect of Franklin's informal conversations with Oswald actually led the latter to represent to the British ministry that 'nothing could be clearer, more satisfactory and convincing' than the arguments for ceding Canada to the United States. Franklin, Adams and John Jay were appointed to treat on behalf of America. It is said 'a cordiality and regard' marked the intercourse

of the American commissioners with Oswald. They met at each other's apartments, and frequently dined together.

The boundary on the north-eastern frontier was a matter of some discussion. At first the English commissioners claimed the whole of Maine, and in default of this to have either the Penobscot or Kennebec as their western limit. The influence of John Adams, who arrived, as he says, 'at a lucky moment for the boundary of Massachusetts,' caused the commissioners to admit that Maine had formerly been considered a part of Massachusetts; and the eastern boundary of Maine then became the subject of animated discussion. Oswald, in the first instance, yielded to the St. John; but his colleagues were less easily won over to American ideas, and after successively abandoning claims to the Kennebec and the Penobscot, finally stopped at the St. Croix. This north eastern boundary was, however, so obscurely defined as to afford a very serious difficulty in later years.

Speaking in the House of Lords, in 1782, Lord Townshend pertinently remarked, 'why could not some one in Canada have been thought of for the business which Oswald was sent to negotiate.' Oswald was, or appeared to be, ignorant how the country lay which he had been granting away.

When the news of the bounds assigned to the United States arrived in America, Luzerne, the French ambassador there, wrote that 'the northern boundary from Lake Superior to the sources of the Mississippi had surpassed all expectations. It gave the Americans four forts that they had found it impossible to capture.'

Regarding the surprise felt in Paris at the terms of the treaty, we have the testimony of the two chief negotiators on the side of France and Spain, viz., Vergennes and Rayneval. Vergennes wrote to Rayneval, Dec. 4, 1782, that the English had rather bought a peace than made one; that their concessions as regards the

boundaries, the fisheries and the Loyalists exceeded anything that he had believed possible. What could have been their motive for what one might interpret as a kind of surrender, he wished Rayneval to discover, as he was in a better position to do so. Rayneval replied that the treaty seemed to him a dream.

The arrangement proposed by the court of France in 1782 would have extended the southern boundary of Canada to the Ohio river, and fixed the Alleghany mountains as the western boundary of the United States.

It is impossible not to be struck with the skill, hardihood and good fortune that marked the American negotiations. Everything the United States could with any show of plausibility demand from England, they obtained; and much of what they obtained was granted them in direct opposition to the wishes of the two great powers by whose assistance they had triumphed.

In a subsequent debate in the House of Commons, Fox spoke of the treaty as 'the most disastrous and degrading peace that the country had ever made.'

9.—Cruelty and Perfidy of the Victors.

New York had been a rallying place for the British during the war, and thither as to a city of refuge the Loyalists naturally turned their faces when the success of their antagonists was assured.

The events of the conflict had been sadly mismanaged, but with the appointment of Sir Guy Carleton to the command, in April, 1782, the British cause at length passed into competent hands.

The severity of the acts against the Loyalists was not mitigated at the close of the war—a fact which aroused the strongest indignation, not only of the Loyalists themselves, but of some few fair-minded men among the Americans. Among these Nathaniel Green contended, 'It would be the excess of intolerance to persecute men for opinions

which but twenty years before had been the universal belief of every class of society.' John Jay wrote that he 'had no desire to conceal the opinion that to involve the Tories in indiscriminate punishment and ruin would be an instance of unnecessary rigor and unmanly revenge without a parallel, except in the annals of religious rage in times of bigotry and blindness.'

The action of the republican leaders of the state of New York at close of the war was particularly discreditable.

The sixth article of the treaty of peace between Great Britain and the United States decreed that there should be 'no confiscations made, nor any prosecutions commenced against any person or persons for or by reason of the part which he or they might have taken in the war; and that no person should on that account suffer any future loss or damage, either in his person, liberty or property; yet at the very next term the supreme court of the state of New York indicted above one thousand reputable, opulent gentlemen, merchants and farmers for high treason in adhering to the enemies of the state.

The terms of the treaty further provided,

That the Congress shall earnestly recommend to the Legislatures of the respective States to provide for the restitution of all Estates, Rights and Properties which have been confiscated . . . that persons shall have free liberty to go to any part or parts of the thirteen United States and therein to remain twelve months unmolested in their endeavours to obtain restitution of such of their estates, rights and properties as may have been confiscated.

The British commissioners naturally expected that a 'recommendation of Congress' would be binding upon all the states. Throughout the war any person that would have disputed the validity of any 'recommendation of Congress' would have been deemed an enemy of his country, held up and advertised as such, exposed to be maltreated by the Sons of Liberty, and subjected to imprisonment. Nevertheless, the provisions inserted

in the treaty for the benefit of the Loyalists were only so much waste paper. Congress did indeed make the formal 'recommendation,' as agreed; but it was well understood that no attempt would be made to carry it into effect, and the state authorities were left free to do as they desired. What they did is forcibly stated by Judge Jones in these words:

No sooner did the Loyalists who had taken protection within the British lines attempt to return to their respective provinces and former places of abode than they were taken up and insulted. Some were tarred and feathered, many tied up and whipped in the most inhuman manner, while others were actually hamstringed and sent back into the British lines . . . Committees were formed in the several states and resolutions of the most violent kind entered into against these unhappy people and all others who should harbour, protect or assist them.

Sir Guy Carleton now set himself seriously about the evacuation of New York and the outposts still in possession of his forces. By the terms of the treaty it was to be done 'with all convenient speed.' He made no unnecessary delays; but he was determined not to leave the country till he could transport the Loyalists, to their respective destinations: and considering the difficulties attending so large an embarkation, the great deficiency of transports for a long time, and the immense number of Loyalists, it is surprising in how short a time Sir Guy was able to complete his task.

Numbers of Loyalists had ere then sought an asylum in Nova Scotia, some had fled to England, many of those in the South had removed to St. Augustine in Florida, the Bahamas, Sumner Islands and Jamaica, some even going to Upper Canada and Newfoundland.

At the evacuation of Savannah, in the summer of 1782, a large number of refugees accompanied the army, but many more remained. These, as soon as the British had departed, suffered frightfully at the hands of their enemies. According to Judge Jones's account,

The Loyalists were seized, hove into dungeons, prisons and provosts. Some were tied up and whipped, others tarred and feathered, some were dragged to horse ponds and drenched till near dead, others were carried about the town in carts with labels upon their backs and breasts with the word 'Tory' in capitals written thereon. All were turned out of their homes and obliged to sleep in the streets or fields and their goods plundered.

. . . To complete the scene, a gallows was erected upon the quay facing the harbour, and twenty-four Loyalists hanged in sight of the British fleet with the army and refugees on board.

Sir Guy Carleton was led to write Elias Bourdinot, the president of Congress, on the 17th of August, 1783, in strong terms, stating that,

The violence of the Americans which broke out soon after the cessation of hostilities increased the number of their countrymen to look to me for escape from threatened destruction. Almost all within these lines conceive the safety of both their property and of their lives depend upon their being removed by me, which renders it impossible to say when the evacuation will be completed. . . But as the daily Gazettes and publications furnish repeated proofs, not only of a disregard to the Articles of Peace, but of barbarous menaces from committees formed in the various towns, cities and districts—even in Philadelphia, the very place chosen by Congress for their residence—I should show an indifference to the feelings of humanity . . . to leave any of the Loyalists that are desirous to quit the country a prey to the violence they conceive they have so much reason to apprehend.

The treatment of the Savannah Loyalists, and the threats freely employed everywhere by the successful Americans, increased the number of exiles greatly; although there is reason to believe that Judge Jones's estimate that not less than 100,000 souls were sent from New York by Sir Guy Carleton prior to the evacuation of the city is exaggerated.

10. — *The Loyal Refugees.*

The feelings of the Loyalists at the close of the war may be more easily imagined than described. The motives that had induced them to espouse the cause of the mother country we have already to some extent considered.

Sabine claims that thousands espoused the royal cause because of 'a dread of the strength and resources of England and the belief that successful resistance to her power was impossible.' This appears, however, to be a mere supposition. The fear of England's power may indeed have deterred for a time many *disloyal* spirits from taking active part in the conflict; but that it caused any considerable number of people to embrace the royal cause against their natural inclination there is really no evidence at all. From the very first all who did not manifest sympathy with the revolutionary movement were exposed to the bitter persecution of mob violence. There was an element, doubtless, that held aloof as much as possible whilst the issue of the contest was in doubt; but the great majority of this cowardly class really sympathized with the rebellion. Sabine himself, speaking of this class of Whigs, says,

If the sky was bright and a Whig victory had been obtained somewhere, and if, above all, no king's troops were near, why then these changing men were steadfast for the right; but if news of reverses reached them, or the royal army came among or near them, then by their own account they always had supported their lawful sovereign, his most gracious majesty.*

This was the class that endeavored, when the success of the Americans was assured, to convince the world of their patriotism by ardently joining in the clamor for vengeance on the Loyalists if they should remain in the country.

Doubtless there was a large proportion of the Loyalists who at the close of the war would have preferred to return quietly to their homes rather than go into voluntary exile. Some of them would have accepted the altered condition of affairs with a fairly good grace; others with more reluctance. There was, however, a numerous class whose resolution to abandon the country was fixed when separation from the British empire became an accomplished fact. Those who formed this heroic resolve were in-

fluenced by various reasons, chief among which were—(1) a sincere attachment to the mother land and love for British institutions, with a corresponding dislike of republicanism; (2) the oaths of allegiance and affirmations of loyalty taken in former years, the fulfilment of which was regarded as a matter not merely of inclination, but of duty; (3) the probability of having to endure the scorn of the winners in the strife, so mortifying to the pride of those who felt that with proper management the conditions might have been reversed; and (4) lastly, that love of adventure which for young and enterprising spirits has always a certain fascination.

But the great bond of union among the Loyalists, pervading all classes, superadded to all the incidental motives that exercised an individual influence, was the desire to maintain the integrity of the British empire; and for that sentiment thousands upon thousands voluntarily abandoned comfortable homes to begin a new life in the wilderness. But, then,

'T was British wilderness!
Where they might sing
Long live the king!

And live protected by his laws,
And loyally uphold his cause.

'T was welcome wilderness!
Though dark and rude
And unsubdued!

For there their sturdy hands,
By hated treason undefiled,
Might win from the Canadian wild
A home on British lands *

The Loyalists who left New York in the spring of 1783 were for the most part voluntary exiles. It was not at that time absolutely known that the provisions contained in the fifth and sixth articles of the treaty would be repudiated by the various state legislatures. These articles provided not merely that the Loyalists should be safe in their persons, but that there should be a restoration of their confiscated property. The event subsequently showed that there was not only no attempt to restore

* LeRoy Hooker.

confiscated property, but that gross personal violence was suffered by those who had made themselves especially obnoxious to the American authorities whenever they attempted to return to their former homes. Those who had not taken an active part on the side of the king were not seriously molested as a rule.

The savage threats and violent temper manifested towards all who had aroused the special animosity of the Whigs, very materially increased the emigration, of that there is not the slightest doubt.

The Loyalists were left in a sad plight by the issue of the war. Their official positions, houses and lands were all necessarily abandoned. They had practically lost all but honor.

Meanwhile they were not without active and influential sympathizers in England. In the House of Commons such men as Burke, Sheridan, Witherforce, Townshend and Lord North strongly advocated their claims for compensation for their past sacrifices. In the House of Lords, Lord Walsingham, Viscount Townshend and Lord Stormont pleaded their cause with equal earnestness and ability.* The efforts thus made were productive of substantial benefit. Pensions were voted to Provincial officers and to some of the rank and file who had served in the war. A commission was appointed for inquiry into the losses, services and claims of the American Loyalists. The proceedings of this commission extended over a period of seven years, during which time 4,118 claims were examined, some in Nova Scotia and Canada and some in England. A large number of claims entered were not pressed. It is to the credit of the Loyalists that the commissioners reported having met with the utmost honour, veracity, and candour, not only from the Agents of the Committee of Loyalists, who were chosen from each

Province for their character and abilities, but likewise from many other of the American Loyalists.'

The commission, as a general rule, awarded a little under one-third of the amount claimed in each instance, the total amount granted being £3,292,455 sterling. The commissioners in their report aptly observe.

Whatever may be said of this unfortunate war, either to account for, to justify, or to apologize for the conduct of either country, all the world has been unanimous in applauding the virtue and humanity of Great Britain in rewarding the services, and in compensating with a liberal hand the losses of those who suffered so much for their faithful and firm adherence to the British Government.

The act of the British government does indeed redound to its credit, yet it is to be borne in mind that the number of claimants, especially in the humbler walks of life, was but a fraction of those who suffered losses and hardships during the civil war. Many either would not or could not employ agents or appear personally to present their claims.

The emigration to Nova Scotia, (began as early as 1776, when about 1,100 refugees embarked for Halifax with the army on the evacuation of Boston. Individuals and small parties continued to find their way from time to time to Nova Scotia from various points in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, and elsewhere, during the progress of the war. Before the close of 1782, a party of 500 Loyalists from New York had arrived at Annapolis. Sir Guy Carleton, in September, wrote Lieut. Governor Hamond, at Halifax, that about 600 refugees wished to embark at New York for Nova Scotia in the autumn, and a much larger number in the spring, but that he could not find shipping just then for more than 300.

In connection with the arrival of the pioneer band of Loyalists at Annapolis the following extract from the London 'Political Magazine' is of interest:—

When the Loyal Refugees from the northern Provinces were informed of the resolution of the house of Commons

* See Ryerson's *Loyalists of America*, vol. ii, pp. 159-164.

against offensive war with the rebels, they instantly saw there were no hopes left them of regaining their ancient settlements or of settling down again in their native country. Those of them therefore, who had been forward in taking up arms and in fighting the battles of the mother country, finding themselves deserted began to look out for a place of refuge and Nova Scotia being the nearest place to their old plantations they determined on settling in that province. Accordingly to the number of 500 they embarked in nine transports for Annapolis Royal; they had arms and ammunition, and one year's provisions, and were put under the care and convoy of his Majesty's ship *Amphitrite*, of 24 guns, Captain Robert Briggs. This officer behaved to them with great attention, humanity and generosity and saw them safely landed and settled in the barracks at Annapolis which the Loyalists soon repaired. There was plenty of wild fowl in the country and at the time of their arrival a goose sold for two shillings and a turkey for two shillings and six pence.

The Reverend Jacob Bailey, the clergyman at Annapolis, himself a Loyalist from Pownalborough, Maine, exerted himself on behalf of the exiles concerning whom he writes:

Every habitation is crowded and many are unable to procure lodgings. Many of these distressed people left large possessions in the rebellious colonies and their sufferings on account of their loyalty and their present uncertain and destitute condition render them very affecting objects of compassion. Many of them are people of education and refinement from every Province on the continent except Georgia.

Shortly after their arrival Mr. Bailey preached what he terms 'a refugee sermon' from the words,

Let them give thanks whom the Lord hath redeemed: and delivered from the hand of the enemy: and gathered them out of the lands from the east and from the west: from the north and from the south.

'Even the Whigs,' writes Mr. Bailey, 'were not unmoved at the representation of our distresses.'

Captain Briggs had spared no pains for the comfort of the Loyalists both during the voyage and after their arrival at Annapolis. He expended £200 out of his own pocket on their behalf—a fact which, whilst it speaks volumes for the captain's goodness of heart, clearly indicates their distressed condition. On the

eve of his departure for New York he was presented with an address expressive of the gratitude of the loyal refugees and signed on their behalf by Amos Botsford, Th. Ward, Fred. Hauser, Sam. Cummings and Elijah Williams. The address is dated at Annapolis Royal the 20th of October, 1782.

The next to arrive in Nova Scotia were some of the unfortunate Carolina Loyalists who fled from Charleston at its evacuation. Governor Parr wrote from Halifax to the British Minister, Dec 7, 1782.

I have the honour to inform you that with the arrival here of the heavy ordnance from Charleston came 500 Refugees, men, women and children, in consequence of directions from Sir Guy Carleton to Lt. Gen. Leslie, who has sent them to the care of Major Patten, commander of the troops in this Province, with whom I have concurred as far as in my power to afford them a reception.

In January, Governor Parr reported further arrivals. The Loyalists who arrived in Nova Scotia towards the close of 1782 were, however, but the advance guard.

11.—*The Expatriation.*

We have now to consider the expatriation of the Loyalists—an event destined to lay the foundation of the Canadian Dominion of to-day.

Gathered in the sea ports of the Atlantic coast, crowds of the exiles awaited the ships expected for their relief.

From all over the seaboard of the continent, refugees made their way to New York to embark for all parts of the world—for England, for Ireland, for Scotland, for Canada, for Nova Scotia, for Cape Breton, for Newfoundland, for the Bermudas, Bahamas, Florida, Jamaica and the West India Islands. Some who had the means formed companies and hired vessels themselves; those who had not were sent away in fleets of transports provided by the British government. The newspapers of the day contained numerous advertisements of the sailing of the former

and official notices regarding the latter.

The Loyalist emigration was naturally attended with some confusion, owing to the excitement engendered by the closing events of the Revolution; yet it was not undertaken in quite the haphazard way that has generally been supposed. True, lack of time prevented careful and diligent examination of the lands on which settlements were to be made; but in many instances agents were sent in advance to make such inquiries and explorations as would suffice to give some idea of the capabilities of the country, and thereby afford a better opportunity of selection on the part of intending immigrants. The largest settlement established at any one place was that at Port Roseway, (afterwards called Shelburne,) which it was fondly imagined would be the Carthage of the Loyalists, and although the selection of Port Roseway as a site for a town of some 12,000 inhabitants eventually proved very unwise, it was not fixed upon without some precaution. The situation had been warmly commended by Sir Andrew Snape Hamond, also by Governor Parr, and by Surveyor General Morris, and it had the further approval of two agents sent from New York to make special examination and inquiry.

Among the arrivals at Annapolis in October, 1782, were Amos Botsford and others employed as agents to ascertain the most favorable localities for establishing settlements. A valuable member of this exploring party was Frederick Hauser*, a man well fitted by practical experience as a land surveyor to form an intelligent idea of the general character of a wilderness country.

Upon their arrival Mr. Botsford and his companions set about their task. They made good use of the time and opportunities at their dis-

posal, and on January 14th were able to transmit to their friends in New York quite a full account of the country. In their letter they describe the region from Annapolis to St. Mary's bay as very good soil, and the situation as favorable to fishing; they praise Annapolis basin and St. Mary's bay and then go on to say:

After viewing this we proceeded to St. John's river, where we arrived the latter end of November: at this season we found our passage up the river difficult, being too late to pass in boats and not sufficiently frozen to bear. In this situation we left the river, and steered by a compass through the woods, encamping out several nights in the course, and went as far as the Oromocto, about seventy miles up the river, where is a block house and a British post. The St. John is a fine river, equal in magnitude to the Connecticut or the Hudson. At the mouth of the river is a fine harbour, accessible at all seasons of the year—never frozen or obstructed by ice.

After an accurate and interesting description of the Falls and general character of the St. John river, the letter continues,

There are many settlers along the river upon the interval land. The interval lies on the river and is a most fertile soil annually matured by the overflowings of the river, and produces crops of all kinds with little labour; and vegetables in the greatest perfection. . . . These intervals would make the finest meadows. The uplands produce wheat both of the summer and winter kinds as well as Indian corn. Here are some wealthy farmers having flocks of cattle. The greater part of the people, excepting the township of Mauderville, are tenants, or seated on the bank without leave or license, merely to get their living. . . . Some of our people chose Conway (now Digby); others give the preference to St. John's. . . . Immense quantities of limestone are found at Fort Howe and at the mouth of the river. We also went up the Kennebecasis, a large branch of the St. John's river, where is a large tract of interval and upland, which has never been granted: it is under a reserve, but we can have it. Major Studholme and Capt. Baxter, who explored the country, chose this place and obtained a grant of 9,000 acres. On each side of this grant are large tracts of good land, convenient for navigation. . . .

The representations of Amos Botsford and his companions seem to have determined the large emigration

* Frederick Hauser subsequently was employed in laying out the grants made to the Loyalists at Kingston, Gaucetown, Sussex and other places on the St. John and Kennebecasis rivers.

from New York to the St. John river the following spring. The agents chosen to arrange for the settlement of the Loyalists in Nova Scotia, as given in Lawrence's Foot prints, were Lt. Col. Benjamin Thompson, Lt. Col. Edward Winslow, Major Upham, Rev. Samuel Seabury, Rev. John Sayre, Amos Botsford and James Peters. After due consideration it was agreed that the Loyalists leaving the thirteen old colonies should be provided with proper vessels to carry them and their horses and cattle as near as possible to the places appointed in Nova Scotia where they were to settle. Besides provisions for the voyage, they were to be allowed one year's provisions in their new homes, or money to enable them to purchase the same. They were also to have an allowance of warm clothing, in proportion to the wants of each family, and an allowance of medicine. They were to be granted pairs of millstones, necessary iron work for grist mills, and other necessary articles for saw mills. They were to receive a quantity of spikes, nails, hoes, axes, spades, shovels, plough irons and such other farming utensils as appeared necessary, and also a proportion of window glass. They were to be provided with tracts of land free from disputed titles and conveniently situated, so as to give from 300 to 600 acres to each family. It was also arranged that 2,000 acres in every township were to be allowed for the support of a clergyman and 1,000 acres for the support of a school; and that these lands should be unalienable forever. They were further to receive a sufficient number of muskets and cannon, with a proper quantity of powder and ball for their use.

These liberal terms were afterwards considerably extended: the Loyalists who came to Nova Scotia were allowed full provisions for their families the first year, two-thirds provisions for the second and one-third for the third year. Those who settled at the town of Parr

were further provided with 500 feet of boards, together with shingles and bricks, for their houses. Those who settled on the St. John river were provided with boats and tents to facilitate the work of settlement.

The account given by Walter Bates doubtless very fairly illustrates the general mode of procedure in the emigration.* In this particular case the agent, Rev. John Sayre, came to announce to the Loyalists at Eaton's Neck, Huntington, Lloyd's Neck, and places in the vicinity on Long Island, that the king had granted to all Loyalists who did not incline to return to their homes and would go to Nova Scotia the privileges just mentioned. The 'king's offer' was duly considered and gladly accepted. Then followed the hasty collection of such possessions as the unfortunate exiles had been able to preserve amid the wreck of their fortunes, and their embarkation in the transport *Union*, Capt. Consett Wilson. The vessel took in her complement of Loyalists at Huntington, Long Island. The embarkation began on Friday, April 11, and was completed on Wednesday following, in which time there were placed on board 209 souls, viz., 65 men, 35 women, 107 children and 2 servants. The deputy agent in charge was Fyler Dibblee, of Stamford, Conn., attorney-at-law.

The *Union* proceeded through East River to New York, the place of rendezvous. A week was consumed in getting together the transports, preparatory to setting sail, but at length, on Saturday, April 26, a fleet of upwards of twenty vessels under convoy set sail from Sandy Hook light, bound for 'St. John's river, Nova Scotia.' This fleet sailed in company with a large number of transports bound for Shelburne and Halifax. The total number of passengers, including some troops, amounted to 7,000, with all their effects, also some artillery and public stores. According to Walter Bates,

* See Kingston and the Loyalists of 1783, pp. 11 and 12

the *Union* was the best ship in the fleet. She proved her capacity as a fast sailer by leading the van for fourteen days and arriving at Partridge Island before the other vessels had come in sight. She was soon afterwards moored in the most convenient situation for landing, the place of anchorage being under the shelter of Fort Howe, opposite Navy Island, in sight of the position where once stood Fort la Tour. To the right lay the 'upper cove,' and beyond rose the rocky peninsula, named by the Indians Monneguash, now the site of a city of nearly 50,000 inhabitants, but then covered for the most part with scrubby pine, spruce and cedar—a rough and forbidding prospect indeed to eyes familiar with the fertile lowlands of Connecticut and New Jersey, and the undulating cultured fields of Long Island.

The 18th of May has been held sacred by the descendants of the founders of St. John as the day on which their Loyalist forefathers landed. Whether there was any formal or systematic act of landing is problematical. The *Union*, and the majority, if not all of the vessels of the fleet, must have arrived (according to Bates's account) on the 10th of May. It had taken the *Union* more than five days to embark her contingent of refugees and their effects. It may therefore be taken for granted, as the facilities for landing were of the rudest description, that the work of getting upwards of 3000 people and their effects on shore was a work of several days. Moreover, there was no common mode of procedure employed. Walter Bates speaks of Capt. Wilson's kindness in allowing his passengers to remain on board the *Union* whilst a deputation was employed in exploring for a proper place of settlement up the river, and contrasts their good fortune with that of others who were 'precipitated on shore.'

We may conclude that on Sunday, May 18, the wearied Loyalists were safely sheltered beneath their tents along the shores of the harbor. Not

improbably they may then have held some service of thanksgiving, and fixed upon the day as one to be annually commemorated.

It is generally supposed that about 3000 people came in this fleet. This seems to the writer a very moderate estimate. The ship *Union*, according to her manifest, (still preserved,) carried 209 persons, and if, as is generally stated, the fleet consisted of upwards of twenty vessels, many of them must have been much smaller than the *Union*, or else the estimate of 3000 people is rather under than over the mark.

The urgent need of transport ships at New York naturally inclined the captains of the vessels which had arrived at St. John to return at the earliest possible moment; but the season was cold and backward, and many of the ships lingered until the 29th of May, when the Loyalists were pretty comfortably settled. Their landing place was at the 'upper cove' the site of the present Market Square, where, having cleared away the dense forest then standing on the spot, the exiles made hurricane houses with sails, under which, with their women and children, they sheltered themselves as best they could.

A New York paper of June 7, 1783, contains the following interesting item:

Yesterday arrived the *Camel*, Captain William Tinker, in eight days from the river St. John in the Bay of Fundy, who at the time of his departure left the new settlers there in good health and spirits. Captain Tinker sailed in company with eight other transports for this port.

On June 7, 1783, Governor Parr wrote to Lord North, the secretary of state, informing him that since his letter of the preceding January, 'there have arrived in different places upwards of 7,000 persons, including men, women and children, and these are to be followed by 3,000 of the Provincial forces, with several others, as I am informed, of different denomination.'

The next fleet to arrive at St. John harbor was that which left Sandy Hook on June 16th, and

reached its destination June 28th, six weeks after the coming of the former fleet. The *Bridgewater*, *Thames*, and possibly one or two other vessels of the first fleet, returned in the second fleet; a proof that Sir Guy Carleton allowed no unnecessary delay in forwarding the Loyalists to their destinations.

It is a little remarkable that scarcely any of our local historians have made any mention of the arrival of the June fleet with its important contingent of some 2,000 Loyalists.* The names of the vessels composing the May fleet have often appeared in print, and their arrival at St. John is annually commemorated; the coming of the 'fall fleet' also is frequently and familiarly referred to; but the arrival of the June fleet appears to have been generally overlooked.

The fleet consisted of thirteen ships and two brigs with a frigate as convoy. Among the vessels were the *Bridgewater*, (Capt. Adnet), *Two Sisters*, (Capt. Brown), *Hopewell*, *Symmetry*, *Generous Friends*, *Thames*, *Amity's Production*, *Tartar*, *Duchess of Gordon*, *Littledale*, *William and Mary*, and *Free Briton*. The Loyalists on board were enrolled in seventeen companies, commanded respectively by Joseph Clarke, Sylvanus Whitney, Joseph Gorham, Henry Thomas, John Forrester, Thomas Elms, John Cock, James Hoyt, Christopher Benson, Joseph Forrester, Thomas Welch, Oliver Bourdet, Asher Dunham, Abra. Camp, Peter Berton, Richard Hill and Moses Pitcher.

The minute details connected with the voyage of the June fleet are preserved in the diary kept by a lady who was a passenger in the ship *Two Sisters*.† She gives a graphic description of the discomforts of a rough passage in an overcrowded vessel, during which, to add to their

miseries, an epidemic of measles broke out among the children.

At the time of the arrival of the second fleet, only two log houses had been erected in the town of Parr. As in the former case, the captains of the vessels seem to have exerted themselves for the comfort of their distressed passengers, who, in some cases, testified their gratitude in a formal manner by presenting suitable addresses. One of these reads as follows:

To Captain Adnet, Commander of the Transport *Bridgewater*.

The address of the Loyalists, that came in the Ship under your command, from New York to St. John's River, Nova Scotia.

Your humanity, and the kindness and attention you have shown, to render as happy as possible, each individual on board your Ship, during the passage, and till their disembarkation, has filled our hearts with sentiments of the deepest gratitude, and merit the warmest return of acknowledgements and thanks, which we most sincerely desire you to accept, wishing you a prosperous voyage to your intended port: we are your very much obliged and humble servants.

Signed by the particular desire, and in behalf of the whole,

John Holland,
Captain Clarke,
Nathaniel Dickinson.

St. John's River, July 15, 1783.

12. — Loyalist Settlements.

Halifax, Shelburne and Annapolis were the principal places in the Nova Scotian peninsula to which the loyal refugees turned their faces; and from these, as centres, were founded a large number of settlements which were destined to play an important part in the future development of the country.

On the coast above Halifax, in Country Harbor, the refugees erected a town to which they gave the name of Stormont, in honor of Lord Stormont, who had so earnestly pleaded their cause in the House of Lords.

Guysborough was settled at the same time by a band of more than a thousand refugees. Subsequently some eight hundred others settled in Cape Breton, chiefly at Baddeck,

* An exception is to be found in Moses H. Perley, who mentions the arrival of the June fleet in his well known lecture on New Brunswick history.

† See diary of Sarah Frost in Kingston and the Loyalists of 1783.

St. Peters and Louisburg. Prince Edward Island, (or the Island of St. John, as it was then called,) furnished an asylum for between three and four hundred of the exiles.

The largest single settlement, as before mentioned, was that at Port Roseway, near the extreme south of Nova Scotia. Here the Loyalists who arrived early in May laid out their town at the mouth of the Roseway river, and named it Shelburne in honor of the colonial secretary. There were 1140 grantees, and in the course of a year the population reached nearly 12,000. Governor Parr paid the town a visit, in July, 1783. He was received on landing with a general discharge of cannon from the shore. He proceeded up King street, both sides of which were lined with the inhabitants under arms, to the place appointed for his reception, where the justices of the peace and other leading citizens were collected to present him with an address. The governor made a speech in reply, and drank the king's health and prosperity to the town and district of Shelburne, and to the settlement of the Loyalists in Nova Scotia. The festivities continued for several days, and the governor departed with favorable impressions regarding the future of the place. The site of Shelburne, however, was unfortunately chosen. Within two or three years after its founding the population began rapidly to decline. However, the statement commonly made, that 'a well nigh *deserted* spot on the spacious bay now marks the site of the transient town,' is quite incorrect. The Shelburne of to-day is a bright, happy looking little town, half hidden among the willows planted by its founders. If it is not the town that it bid fair to be in its early days, it is not losing ground now. Upon the slopes behind modern Shelburne remain land marks of the ancient town—old foundations of houses, remains of cellars, streets, and traces of streets with acres and acres of land laid out in squares.

'Here, over these old cellars,' says

a modern visitor, 'resided for a time jurists and bankers, wine merchants, wig makers, dealers in snuff and dealers in hair powder, gunsmiths, silversmiths, carvers and all other functionaries belonging to a proud city of a hundred years ago. Along the grass and tree covered spaces which were laid out for streets, once strode martial figures familiar to many a battle field and grave dignitaries with the wigs and cloaks of their time. Over these rocks tripped gay ladies in silk attire and merry maidens in homespun. Here, in some rudely built house, whose interior furnishings and embellishments contrasted strangely with its external appearance, stately dames were escorted to dinner by stately men, and the great grandmothers of the present generation trod the minuet.'

In a year or two after the landing of its founders, the city had reached its maximum, and was for a very brief period the largest town in what is now the maritime provinces. Five years later it had shrunk to less than one fourth its former size, and, compared with Halifax or St. John, was out of the race.

The settlements established in the township of Digby and in the neighborhood of Annapolis were favorably situated, and from the first continued to improve.

Aylesford and Rawdon received a proportion of the refugees. The Douglas settlement was filled by disbanded soldiers of the 84th regiment; while the vacant lands at Clements, in Annapolis county, were largely taken up by Loyalists and disbanded Hessian soldiers.

At the close of the revolution there were in New York at least 2,000 negroes who had been induced by a proclamation of Sir Henry Clinton's to come within the British lines upon a solemn assurance of liberty, safety and protection. At the peace, a large number of these negroes, desirous of preserving their freedom and dreading the vengeance of their former masters, took passage in the ships bound for Nova Scotia. Washington, on behalf of the American

Congress, very strongly protested against such a proceeding. In a letter to Sir Guy Carleton, May 6, 1783, he refers to their personal conference on the same day, and says:

I was surprised to hear you mention that an embarkation had already taken place, in which a large number of negroes had been carried away. I cannot conceal from you that my private opinion is that the measure is totally different from the letter and spirit of the treaty.

In reply, Sir Guy Carleton insisted that it could not have been the intention of the British Government, by the treaty of peace, to reduce themselves to the necessity of violating their faith to the negroes who came into the British lines under the proclamations of his predecessors. 'The negroes in question,' said Sir Guy, 'I found free when I arrived at New York. I had therefore no right, as I thought, to prevent their going away to any part of the world they thought proper.' He further urges that delivering them up to their former masters would be delivering them up, some possibly to executions, and others to severe punishments, which in his opinion would be a dishonorable violation of the public faith pledged the negroes in the proclamations. If the sending them away should hereafter be declared an infraction of the treaty, compensation must be made to the owners by the crown of Great Britain. Sir Guy added that he had taken measures to provide for this contingency by directing an accurate register to be kept of all negroes who went off, specifying the name, age and occupation of the slave and the name and place of residence of his former master. Had the negroes been denied permission to embark, they would, in spite of every means to prevent it, have found various methods of quitting New York; the former owners would no longer have been able to trace them, and of course would have lost in every way all chance for compensation. Speaking of the action of Sir Guy Carleton in this matter, Judge Jones says:

Congress and the several legislatures of the States jumped at his proposal. A val-

uation of the slaves was made and approved. The money, it is true, has never been paid. What occasioned it? An absolute refusal on the part of the Americans to comply with a single article in the treaty in favor of the Loyalists.

Very many of the negro refugees settled at Birchtown, near Shelburne, and nearly 400 more in Digby and Annapolis counties.

Some further particulars regarding the size and importance of the Loyalist settlements may be gleaned from the following—

General Return of all the Disbanded Troops and other Loyalists who have lately become Settlers in the Province of Nova Scotia, made up from the Rolls taken by the several Muster-Masters: Halifax, 4th Novr., 1784.

Halifax Harbour,	48
Dartmouth,	480
Musquodobbins,	16
Jeddore,	26
Ship Harbour,	151
Sheet Harbour,	122
Country Harbour,	289
Chedebucto,	1053
Island of St. John,	380
Antigonish,	120
Pictou and Merrigonish,	324
Cumberland, etc.,	856
Partridge Island	188
Cornwallis and Horton,	237
Newport and Kentecoot,	307
Windsor,	278
Windsor Road and Sackville,	130
Annapolis, Granville, Wilnot and Clements,	1830
Bear River,	115
Digby,	1295
Gulliver's Hole, St. Mary's Bay and Sissiboo,	173
Nine Mile River,	72
Chester Road,	28
At Halifax (objects of charity),	208
Between Halifax and Shelburne,	651
Shelburne,	7923
Total,	17300

Of this total there were 7419 men, 3563 women, 2701 children above ten years of age, 2826 children under ten years, and 791 servants.

From the reports of the muster-masters, the following remarks are taken:—

Dartmouth. This settlement, from its vicinity to Halifax and some other good harbors, promises to be a place of importance soon.

Musquodobbins. The muster-master reports that this is a promising little settlement; that the harbor abounds with fish of every kind, both winter and summer.

Ship Harbour. The Loyalists here are industrious laborious people. The muster-master says they, as well as the disbanded troops, are still in the dark with respect to their lands; that many of the latter have quit the settlement on that account, and if not soon remedied it will drive the whole away.

Sheet Harbour. No lands have yet been granted to these people. That which they now occupy is a donation from a Mr. Kirby, who holds a tract of 8,000 acres here.

Country Harbour. This place exhibits instances of industry and perseverance that do honor to the settlers.

Chedebucto. There are at this place 228 Negro settlers exclusive of the blacks employed as servants. This is a good harbor and fertile soil.

Island of St. John. Great delays have arisen in laying out lands for the people. The muster-master complains that Governor Patteson declined giving him assistance, and that great abuses have been committed in the issue of provisions.

Antigonish, Pictou and Merrigouish. These settlements afford the most agreeable appearance of industry, and promise to become in a little time very flourishing.

Cornwallis and Horton. From the inattention of the surveyor many of these people, from not getting their lands, have been obliged to leave the lands they were cultivating.

Newport and Kentecoot. The settlers here wear the appearance of industry, and will be able to raise a quantity of grain and vegetables this season.

Annapolis, Granville, Wilnot and Clements. The settlers in these districts are very enterprising in their endeavours to improve the country, particularly those at Wilnot.

Bear River. The settlers here have made great improvements; there is not one of them who has not planted a crop of some kind or other.

Digby. This is a good harbor and the settlement is in a very flourishing condition.

Gulliver's Hole, St. Mary's Bay and Sissiboo. These settlements are in a very promising condition owing to the exertions of the settlers. Sissiboo is conveniently situated for a fishery.

Nine Mile River. The people seem pleased with their situation.

Settlements between Halifax and Shelburne. The commissary of musters observes that the harbors of Prospect, Margaret's Bay, Chester, Lunenburg, La Have, Port Matoon and the Ragged Islands are well situated for fisheries and that the settlements of Loyalists at those places will afford a respectable defence to the coast.

The unfortunate people included in the foregoing return as objects of

charity at Halifax consisted chiefly of crippled soldiers and the widows and orphans of Loyalists and soldiers. Col. Edward Winslow, in one of his private letters written at Halifax, Sep. 25. 1784, says, 'It is not possible for any pen or tongue to describe the variety of wretchedness that is at this time exhibited in the streets of this place.' Amongst those who appealed for a share of the government provisions issued under his supervision, he instances 'a little multitude of old crippled Refugees—men and women who have seen better days.' 'Some of them,' he says, 'tell me they formerly knew me; they have no other friend to depend upon, and they solicit in language so emphatical and so pathetic that 'tis impossible for any man whose heart is not callous to every tender feeling to refuse their requests. Next to them comes an unfortunate set of Blackies begging for Christ's sake that Masser would give 'em a little provisions if it's only for one week. "He wife sick, he children sick, and he will die if he have not some."'

'I am illy calculated for such services,' adds Winslow. 'It is not possible to relieve their distresses; I long to retreat from such scenes.'

The Loyalists at Shelburne soon found their prospects less encouraging than they had anticipated, and many of them wrote to their friends at New York by no means to come to that place, in consequence of which more than 200 families decided to establish a settlement at Albaco, one of the Bahama Islands. Another large party, under the command of Alexander White, formerly Sheriff of Tryon Co., New York, appear to have sailed for Canada in a fleet which left New York on the 9th July. Shortly before the final evacuation of that city, two ships laden with Loyalists, convoyed by the brig *Hope*, sailed up the St. Lawrence to Sorel, where they united with others who had come by way of the old military road down the Richelieu. The united parties spent the winter in log huts, and in the following spring proceeded up

the river in flat bottomed boats and established themselves at various points from Glengarry to the Bay of Quinte.

By the Hudson and Mohawk, past Oswego, another stream of emigrants made their way, to settle along Lake Ontario and the Niagara river; and Loyalist districts extended even to Detroit along the shore of Lake Erie. Probably 10,000 Loyalists, 'men and women of determination and principle,' laid at this time the foundation of the noble province of Ontario. There was a large military element from the disbanded Provincial corps, including the 84th Royal New York, or Royal Green, and the Highland Fencibles.

Dr. Ryerson gives many interesting details regarding the settlements established by the United Empire Loyalists in what was then western Canada.

The precise number of Loyalists who at various times found an asylum within the borders of the old province of Nova Scotia it is difficult to determine. The exodus from the revolted colonies which began with the evacuation of Boston, in 1776, continued throughout the war; but many who came during this period sought merely a temporary refuge and did not remain. Many, too, of the immense multitude that arrived in the great immigration of 1783 were discouraged by the outlook, and as soon as possible either returned to the States or made their homes in other parts of the British dominions. The place of these transient inhabitants was in some measure supplied by those who continued to find their way to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick during the years immediately following the peace.

Many prominent loyal refugees who had been in England awaiting the issue of the conflict, when the independence of the United States was assured, concluded to begin life anew in the northern provinces that remained to the crown. About the middle of August, 1784, three hundred poverty stricken refugees arrived at Halifax in the transport *Sally*;

and despatches received from London announced that a further number of Loyalists then in England might shortly be expected, vessels having been chartered by the government for the purpose of bringing them out.

No enumeration taken at any one time will suffice to show the total number of those who came to Nova Scotia; but it may be approximately fixed at 35,000.

The reader who has any curiosity upon the subject can compare the following statements:—

1. Rev. John Breynton, missionary at Halifax, in his report to the S. P. G. for the year 1784, says that '30,000 Loyalists are settled in Nova Scotia.'

2. Governor Parr, in a letter to Gen. Haldimand, of Jan. 14, 1784, writes that '30,000 Loyalists have arrived in Nova Scotia'; and seven months afterwards he informed Lord North, the secretary of state, that 'the number now located amounts to near 30,000.'

3. Sir Brook Watson states in one of his letters: 'In 1783, as Commissary General to the army, it became my duty under the command of Sir Guy Carleton to embark 35,000 Loyalists at New York to take shelter in Nova Scotia; and,' he adds, 'I trust all in my power was done to alleviate the sufferings of those who were so severely treated for endeavouring to support the union of the British Empire.'

4. Mr. E. F. deLancey, of the New York Historical Society, is satisfied, from a personal examination of the MS. records in the secretary's office at Halifax, that the emigration amounted to at least 35,000 men, women and children.'

5. The Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's treasury, having been convinced by Sir Guy Carleton's forcible representation of the necessity of continuing for some time the aid extended the Loyalists on their arrival, issued an order 'to victual the Loyalists in Nova Scotia—being 33,682—whereof 4,691 are under ten years, at two-thirds allowance, from

the 1st of May, 1784, to the 1st of May, 1785, and from that period at one-third allowance, to the 1st of May, 1786; estimating the whole ration at one pound of flour and one pound of beef or twelve ounces of pork; the children under ten years of age to have a moiety of the allowance made to grown persons.'

13.—*The Loyal Regiments Disbanded.*

Reference has been already made to the fact that a large number of Loyalists were enrolled in the king's service and served with distinction throughout the war. After the cessation of active hostilities, the violent temper manifested by the victorious Americans caused the officers commanding his Majesty's Provincial regiments to unite in laying their cause before Sir Guy Carleton, in a letter dated March 14, 1783, in which they state:

That from the purest principles of loyalty and attachment to the British government they took arms in his Majesty's service; and relying on the justice of their cause and the support of their Sovereign and the British nation, they have persevered with unabated zeal through all the vicissitudes of a calamitous and an unfortunate war. That their hearts still glow with loyalty to their Sovereign and the same attachment to the British Constitution which first stimulated them to action That whatever stipulations may be made at the peace for the restoration of the property of the Loyalists and permission for them to return home, yet, should the American Provinces be severed from the British Empire, it will be utterly impossible for those who have served his Majesty in arms in this war to remain in the country. The personal animosities that arose from civil dissensions have been so heightened by the blood that has been shed in the contest that the parties can never be reconciled.

The letter goes on to refer to sacrifices of property, of lucrative professions, etc., made at the call of duty; and to the anxiety felt for the welfare of their families:

Wives born to the fairest expectations and tenderly brought up, and children for whose education and future happiness they feel the most anxious concern . . .

Many who have served in the Provincial

troops in subordinate capacities during the war have been respectable yeomen, of good connections and possessed of considerable property which from principles of loyalty and a sense of duty they quitted, and in the course of the contest have shown a degree of patience, fortitude and bravery almost without example.

Reference is made to the 'great number of men incapacitated by wounds, many having helpless families who have seen better days;' and the letter concludes as follows:

Relying on the generous promises of their Sovereign to support and protect them, and placing the fullest confidence in your Excellency's benevolent interposition and favorable representation of their faithful services, they are induced to ask—

That grants of land may be made to them in some of his Majesty's American Provinces and that they may be assisted in making settlements in order that they and their children may enjoy the benefit of British government.

That some permanent provision may be made for such of the non-commissioned officers and privates as have been disabled from wounds, and for the widows and orphans of deceased officers and soldiers.

That as a reward for their services the rank of the officers be made permanent in America, and that they may all be entitled to half pay upon the reduction of their regiments.

(Signed by the commanding officers of fourteen Provincial corps.)*

Perhaps the most influential of the officers at this time in command of the Provincial regiments was Lieut. Col. Benjamin Thompson, of the King's American Dragoons. The source of his especial influence with the British ministry we may gather from the following passage in a letter written by Judge Jonathan Sewell to Ward Chipman, Oct. 2d, 1781:

I send this under the care of Colonel Thompson—there's a fortunate young fellow for you—from being scarcely known in America to become Lord G. Germaine's favorite and one of his under secretaries and now a colonel of a regiment in British pay; but all agree he is well deserving of the favors fortune showers upon him.

Col. Thompson actively exerted himself on behalf of his Loyalist comrades in arms. In a letter to Lord North, written in London, June

* This letter is given in full in the Annual Register for 1783.

8, 1783, he mentions having personally assisted in drawing up the representation and petition of the commanding officers of the loyal regiments and adds:

The situation of the Provincial officers, particularly such of them as are natives, or were formerly inhabitants of the American colonies, is truly distressing. Having sacrificed their property and all the expectations arising from their rank and connections in civil society, and being now cut off from all hopes of returning to their former homes by the articles of the peace, they have no hope left but in the justice and humanity of the British nation.

I will not trouble your Lordship with an account either of their services or of their sufferings; their merit as well as their misfortunes are known to the whole world, and I believe their claim upon the humanity and upon the justice of this country will not be disputed.

They have stated their situation in a strong but at the same time most respectful manner in their representation, which I am informed has been transmitted to his Majesty's Secretary of State by Sir Guy Carleton, and strongly recommended.

As they are extremely anxious to know their fate, I am to request of your Lordship that I may be informed whether any and what resolutions have been taken relative to their petitions, and whether their claims of permanent rank in America and half-pay upon the reduction of their regiments will meet with the countenance and support of his Majesty's Ministers. Your Lordship will see by the enclosed extract of a letter I have just received from New York, how anxious the Provincial officers are and how much they expect that I should exert myself in their behalf.

The subject referred to by Col. Thompson had already received consideration, and on the 9th day of June, 1783, were issued the King's orders and instructions to Sir Guy Carleton respecting the disbanding of the Loyalist and other regiments. The uncertainty of the Loyalists at New York was not set at rest until some two months later, when his Majesty's instructions arrived in America. These instructions provided that—

The non-commissioned officers and private men of the land forces, who may be reduced in Nova Scotia, and wish to become settlers in that province, will be allowed grants of lands at the rate of 200 acres to every non-commissioned officer, and 100 acres to every private man, exclusive of what he shall be entitled to in right of his family, discharged of all fees

of office and quit rents for the first ten years. And as a further inducement to them to become settlers, each man shall be furnished out of the public stores, with the usual rations of provisions allowed to him for one year, and shall be permitted to retain his arms and accoutrements.

It was further provided that an allowance of half-pay to the commissioned officers entitled thereto should be made from the time of disbanding, and that the non-commissioned officers and men should receive a gratuity of fourteen days' pay on the day of their discharge. The Loyalist corps, with such men of the British regiments as desired to be discharged in America, were directed to hold themselves in readiness to embark for Nova Scotia, unless any of them should choose to be dismissed at New York.

The loyal regiments mentioned in the instructions, with their commanding officers, were:—

The Royal American Regiment (or 60th foot) 3rd and 4th battalions, General Lord Amherst in command.

King's American Regiment, Col. Edmund Fanning.

Queen's Rangers, Col. John Graves Simcoe.

British Legion of Cavalry, Lieut. Col. Sornistree Tarleton.

New York Volunteers, Lt. Col. George Turnbull.

Loyal American Regiment, Col. Beverly Robinson.

New Jersey Volunteers, Brigadier General Cortlandt Skinner commanding, 1st Battalion, Lt. Col. Elisha Lawrence; 2nd Battalion, Lt. Col. John Morris; 3rd Battalion, Lt. Col. Isaac Allen.

DeLancey's Brigade, Brigadier General Oliver DeLancey, commanding, 1st Battalion, Col. John Harris Cruger; 2nd Battalion, Col. George Brewerton.

Prince of Wales' American Regiment, Col. Montford Browne.

Pennsylvania Loyalists Lt. Col. William Allen.

Maryland Loyalists, Lt. Col. James Chalmers.

Loyal American Legion, Brigadier General Benedict Arnold.

Detachment of Royal Garrison Battalion, Lt. Col. Robert Donkin.

British Legion of Infantry.

Royal Guides and Pioneers, Col. Beverly Robinson.

King's American Dragoons, Lt. Col. Benjamin Thompson.

In addition to the above, several other corps were in whole or in part

disbanded in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, among which were the Carolina King's Rangers, Lt. Col. Thomas Browne; King's Orange Rangers, Lt. Col. John Bayard; Royal Fencible Americans, Lt. Col. Joseph Gorham; DeLancey's 3rd Battalion, Col. Gabriel G. Ludlow; the 2nd Battalion of the 84th, or Royal Highland Emigrants, Sir Guy Carleton in command; and a part of the 42nd, or Royal Highland Regiment of foot, Lord John Murray in command.

Col. Edward Winslow* in a memorial to the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's treasury, mentions the interesting fact that at the peace he was sent by the commander-in-chief, Sir Guy Carleton, to explore and locate lands for the officers and men of the disbanded corps to that part of Nova Scotia which is now called New Brunswick—a duty which he executed without fee or reward.

Whilst thus engaged Col. Winslow was intimately associated with Brigadier General Henry E. Fox, then commander-in-chief of his Majesty's forces in Nova Scotia.

A few selections from the official correspondence of the day will throw some light upon the proceedings connected with the disbanding of the loyal corps.

General Fox wrote Governor Parr from Annapolis Royal, Sept. 16:—

By letters received this day from his Excellency, the Commander-in-Chief [Sir

* Col. Edward Winslow was Muster-Master General of the Provincial forces during the greater part of the war. His duties were at the first of an extremely arduous nature. He was frequently exposed to danger from the constant necessity of visiting all the outposts of the army. His efforts to correct the irregularities and detect the errors which were committed in the accounts of the Provincial troops he says involved him in personal quarrels and in two instances personal combats. The subsequent appointment of Col. Alexander Innes, of the South Carolina Loyalists, to the post of Inspector General of Loyalist forces, in a measure relieved him from the responsibilities that had previously devolved upon him.

Guy Carleton] I find that it is his wish that the Provincial Regiments should be discharged as contiguous as possible to the lands on which they are to settle, for which purpose he desires me to communicate with your Excellency and request that you would be pleased to determine the district of country where the different Regiments are to settle that they may be immediately ordered to their respective destinations.

Those Regiments which were embarking at New York are by the Commander-in-Chief's particular order to proceed immediately to the River St. John and to take possession of that tract of land which your Excellency has assigned the Provincial corps. And the King's American Dragoons being already settled at that place it only remains that your Excellency should point out places for the accommodation of the Fencible Americans, commanded by Lieut. Col. Gorham, and the King's Orange Rangers, commanded by Lieut. Col. Bayard—the Loyal Nova Scotia Volunteers not being particularly mentioned in the above order for induction.

Whenever I may be favoured with your Excellency's decision relative to these corps, I shall give the necessary orders for their moving to the places assigned them.

The following day Edward Winslow wrote from Annapolis to Major Samuel Bayard, commanding the King's Orange Rangers, requesting him to make immediate application to Governor Parr in order to ascertain the location assigned his corps, so that orders might be given for removing such of the commissioned and non-commissioned officers and private men as were disposed to avail themselves of their grants to the place assigned them, in order to be there disbanded. Major Bayard in reply wrote that his Excellency had been pleased to grant a tract of land for that purpose at a place called *Quoko Head*, in the Bay of Fundy, a few leagues to the eastward of the entrance of the St. John river.

On the 28th of September, General Fox wrote from 'Augh Pack'† to General Haldimand at Quebec:

The whole of the Provincial Regiments, consisting of upwards of 3000 men are embarked for the River St. John, where they are to become settlers, and a tract of

† The old Indian village on the St. John river, six miles above Fredericton.

land assigned them extending from the townships of Maugerville and Burton, on both sides of the river on the route to Canada, as far as to accommodate the whole, which will be a very considerable distance.

This circumstance will, I flatter myself, agreeably facilitate the communication between the provinces of Nova Scotia and Canada, an object which I am informed your Excellency is anxious to effect, and which it is very evident must greatly contribute to the benefit of both provinces.

The same day General Fox issued an order in which Major Murray was directed to disband the King's American Dragoons at the 'Township of Prince William' on the 10th of October.

On his return to Fort Howe, Oct. 1st, Gen. Fox issued an order for the disbanding of the companies of the Royal Fencible Americans in garrison at that place.

Owing to the late arrival of the royal instructions in America, and to the lack of shipping, the majority of the Loyalist troops to be disbanded on the St. John river did not leave New York until Monday, the 15th of September, the vessels arriving at St. John on or about the 24th of the same month. Very inadequate preparations had been made for their reception and the lateness of their arrival rendered their situation pitiable in the extreme. One of the vessels of the fleet, the *Martha*, with about 170 souls on board, including a part of the Maryland Loyalists and a part of the third battalion of DeLancey's brigade, was wrecked on a ledge off Tusket river, and about a hundred perished miserably; the remainder were taken from rafts by four Massachusetts fishing vessels and landed at Yarmouth.

The distressed situation of the Loyalist soldiers when they had arrived at St. John deeply impressed Edward Winslow, who, in writing to Ward Chipman, his old friend and deputy Muster-master-general, says:

I have seen those 'provincials' which we have so frequently mustered, landing in this inhospitable climate in the month of October, without a shelter and without knowing where to find a place to reside. The chagrin of the officers was not to me

so truly affecting as the poignant distress of the men. Those reputable sergeants of Ludlow's, Fanning's, Robinson's, etc., (once hospitable yeomen of the country,) addressed me in language that almost murdered me as I heard it:—'Sir, we have served all the war; we were promised land: we expected you had obtained it for us. We like the country; only *let us have a spot of our own* and give us such kind of regulations as shall protect us.'

Many of the soldiers, with their wives and families, spent their first winter at 'Lower Cove' in log huts or bark camps; some even in tents covered with spruce branches brought in boats from Partridge Island. Their sufferings were naturally very severe, and a number of persons died through exposure.

Speaking of this time, Peter Fisher, in his little work *Sketches of New Brunswick*, published in 1825, says:

'Frequently in the piercing cold of winter a part of the family had to remain up during the night to keep fire in their huts to prevent the other part from freezing. Some very destitute families made use of boards to supply the want of bedding; the father or some of the elder children remaining up by turns and warming suitable pieces of boards which they applied alternately to the smaller children to keep them warm; with many similar expedients.

The lateness of their arrival, combined with the fact that no definite grants had as yet been assigned the several corps, induced the great majority of the disbanded troops to remain at the town of Parr during the winter. A few adventurous spirits, however, pushed on to Saint Anne's Point, where they arrived in the early part of November, after a nine days' journey up the river. Before they had time to complete their huts, the snow was on the ground, and part of the winter was spent in tents. The awfulness of their situation can be readily imagined. 'Women, delicately reared, cared for their infants beneath canvas tents rendered habitable only by the banks of snow which lay six feet deep in the open spaces of the forest. Men unaccustomed to toil looked with dismay towards a future which seemed hopeless.' Through the

non-arrival of the supplies expected before the close of navigation, starvation at one time stared the little colony in the face; and, as one said who as a child passed through the experience of those dreadful days, 'Strong, proud men wept like children, and lay down in their snow bound tents to die.' Frequently had these poor settlers to go from fifty to one hundred miles, with hand sleds or toboggans, through wild woods or on the ice, to procure a precarious supply for their famishing families. The privations and sufferings endured in some instances almost exceed belief.

14.—*The Division of the Province.*

A vast impetus was given to the development of the country north of the Bay of Fundy by the coming of the Loyalists. In the course of a few months it passed from the condition of a comparatively unknown region with a mere handful of English speaking people to that of an independent province with an enterprising class of inhabitants—poor in purse, indeed; but rich in experience, determination, energy, education, intellect, and other qualities essential to the building up of a country. By their efforts, within a year towns sprang into existence at St. John, Fredericton and St. Andrews, and thriving settlements were founded at Kingston, Sussex Vale, Gagetown, Waterborough, Burton, and other places on the river St. John as well as in Westmorland county and at various points around the shores and on the rivers of Charlotte county. From these places as centres, other settlements were established. Even the North Shore shared in the benefits of the immigration. This was largely through the enterprise of William Davidson, the pioneer English settler on the Miramichi, who in 1783 engaged fifty families of loyal refugees to settle on the Miramichi and Restigouche rivers. These new settlers, with Messrs. Munro, Doyle and others at the Bay of Chaleur, and Mr. Powell at Richibucto, exer-

cised an important influence in the future development of their several localities.

More than twelve thousand Loyalists came to that portion of the old province of Nova Scotia now called New Brunswick. Many of those mentioned in Col. Morse's return as settled in the county of Cumberland* had established themselves on the Petitcodiac river and elsewhere in the present counties of Westmorland and Albert. The number who settled on the St. John river was about ten thousand. The list of those entitled to provisions in this district comprised 4,131 men, 1,619 women, 1,630 children over ten years, 1,439 children under ten years and 441 servants—9,260 persons in all; but Col. Morse in his return states that for reasons mentioned in the report of Thomas Knox, Esq., Deputy Commissary of Musters, it had been found impossible to ascertain the exact number of Loyalists mustered on the river Saint John. Mr. Knox mentions, among the difficulties encountered in his work in the immense district of country assigned to him, the fact that there had been frequent interchanges among the earlier arrivals, who, unlike the disbanded troops, were not enrolled in companies. He found that absent families were daily expected. Many of the soldiers were not yet on their lands; others had already abandoned them.

The city of Saint John was for a brief period a sort of distributing point, and at the close of the first half year of its existence the population probably amounted to six or seven thousand. But this number rapidly decreased as difficulties respecting the location of grants were disposed of and new settlements sprang into existence in various parts of the province. That portion of the present city lying to the south of Union street at first received the

*By the division of the province of Nova Scotia the largest part of the old county of Cumberland was included in the province of New Brunswick.

name of Parr. The town was laid out in 1454 lots, by Paul Bedell. A few favored individuals appear to have enjoyed the privilege of selecting their lots; but the great majority were drawn by the Loyalists in the usual manner, as they arrived in the country. Many who came with the intention of proceeding at once to the cultivation of their lands were compelled to remain at the mouth of the river until provision was made for the survey and allotment of their grants. The following words, written by Col. Morse eighteen months after the arrival of the first band of Loyalists, will give an idea of the situation:—

I am sorry to add that a very small proportion indeed of these people are yet upon their lands, owing to different causes—*First*, their arriving very late in the season; *Secondly*, timely provision not having been made by escheating and laying out lands, in which great delays and irregularities have happened; *Thirdly*, a sufficient number of surveyors not having been employed; but *Lastly*, and principally, the want of foresight and wisdom to make necessary arrangements, and steadiness in carrying them out.

The evils arising from mismanagement, Col. Morse affirmed, would be felt for a long time to come. Hitherto the Loyalists had been mostly employed in building towns, and by their exertions at Port Roseway and at the mouth of the river St. John large towns had been built in an astonishingly short time. These great exertions, in his opinion, would have been more profitably directed in cultivating their lands; since, besides the loss of time, they had wasted their substance in that which was unlikely to prove either profitable to themselves or useful to the country.

To add to the uneasiness of those who were awaiting their lands, information was received, in August, 1783, that fifty-five prominent Loyalists in the city of New York had united in an application for tracts of land in Nova Scotia, amounting to 275,000 acres, and that they had dispatched agents to survey the unlocated lands and select the most fertile spots and desirable situations on the St. John river. The dissatisfac-

tion caused by this proceeding was so great at the town of Parr that four hundred persons signed an agreement to remove to Passamaquoddy. Equal indignation was displayed at New York, where a memorial was speedily drawn up and very largely signed, and presented to the commander-in-chief by Messrs. Samuel Hake, Elias Hardy, Captain Henry Law and Tertullus Dickenson. The memorialists state:

That they had determined to remove with their families and settle in his majesty's province of Nova Scotia on the terms which they understood were held out *equally* to all his Majesty's persecuted subjects. . . . That chagrined as the memorialists are at the manner in which the late contest has been terminated and disappointed as they find themselves in being left to the lenity of their enemies on the dubious recommendation of their leaders, they yet hoped to find an asylum under British protection, little suspecting there would be found amongst their fellow sufferers, persons ungenerous enough to attempt engrossing to themselves so disproportionate a share of what government has allotted for their common benefit, and so different from the original proposals. . . . The memorialists cannot but regard the grants in question if carried into effect as amounting nearly to a total exclusion of themselves and families who if they become settlers must content themselves with barren or remote lands, or submit to be tenants. . . .

The petitioners met with a most favorable reception at the hands of the commander-in-chief, who emphatically assured them, '*No one* person will obtain a larger grant of lands in Nova Scotia than 1000 acres.' Sir Guy further stated that in his opinion no persons should be allowed to take up lands in that province but those who mean to reside in it, till the Loyalists were first served. Personally he would do everything in his power for the memorialists, and he believed they would have no cause to complain.

The situation at St. John, however, continued to be a matter of much anxiety. The Rev. John Sayre, writing to the S. P. G., in the month of October, 1783, says that he found on his arrival a multitude of his fellow sufferers at the mouth of the river unsettled, and

many of them on the brink of despair on account of the delays in allotting their lands to them.

Complaints were made that whilst their urgent necessities were not properly cared for, the Loyalists could not make their voice heard in the councils of the country, because the settlements north of the bay of Fundy were practically without representation in the provincial assembly.

Governor Parr's popularity with the New Brunswick Loyalists—if he ever had any—soon vanished. There is every reason to suppose that his Excellency was sincerely desirous of facilitating the settlement of the country; but, giving him all credit for good intentions, it may be seriously questioned whether he were just the man for the emergency. In person he was exceedingly stout* and this fact, combined with advancing years, unfitted him for very active physical exertion. The difficulties of communication appear to have deterred him from ever visiting Saint John, where serious complications on more than one occasion rendered it highly desirable that active measures should have been employed under his personal supervision. Instead of this he acted through agents sent thither from time to time, and in his letter to the secretary of state, (Lord North), written on the 10th of August, 1784, he says:

I flatter myself that the measures I have taken with the people on St. John's river and by bringing some of the leading men of the parties there to this side of the Bay of Fundy will prove effectual to suppress factious commotions in the settlements of that river.

Vain hope! Not thus was the problem to be solved.

Col. Edward Winslow appears to have been the first to suggest the measure of forming a separate govern-

ment, as the only possible means of effectually remedying the difficulties of the situation. The proposition commended itself to General Fox and was warmly taken up by leading Loyalists.

Dissatisfaction at the time was by no means confined to the town of Parr and the settlements on the river St. John. A very extensive settlement had been established on the shores of Passamaquoddy bay, consisting of Loyalists from New York and Penobscot, with a contingent of the disbanded Royal Fencible Americans. The numbers as given in Col. Morse's muster were 833 men, 304 women, 340 children over ten years and 310 under ten years—in all 1787 persons. Here, too, dissatisfaction prevailed. In a letter to Ward Chipman, Edward Winslow says:

Since our first proposal, a vast number of settlers have arrived in this country. About all the people who composed the garrison of Penobscot are now at Passamaquoddy. The late American Fencibles, Dr. Paine and a large party are also there. Samuel Bliss with another party—in short the number that have emigrated to that side of the bay is astonishing. All these men are waiting with the most eager impatience for some regulations in their favour. All agree that nothing short of a separate government can effectually serve them. Surely it must happen; it must be for the interest as well as the honor of the British Government to snatch from despair so many of its faithful subjects.

The division of Nova Scotia into two provinces was announced in September, 1784; and on the 21st of November Col. Thomas Carleton, the first governor, arrived in St. John and received a most enthusiastic welcome. In the address presented to the new governor, the resentment entertained towards Governor Parr and his advisors finds expression. The inhabitants term themselves 'a number of oppressed and insulted Loyalists,' congratulate Col. Carleton on his arrival to correct the injustice of the past and to establish such laws as are essential to the welfare of the new province, adding that they were formerly free men and again hoped to be such under his auspices.

*In a letter to Gen. Haldimand, dated July 21, 1784, Governor Parr requests a good strong horse to be sent him from Quebec, as he rides 'better than seventeen stone,' (say, 245 lbs.).

15.—*The Soldiers' Grants.*

It has already been shown that the selection of the valley of the river St. John as the place of settlement of so many of the disbanded Loyal regiments arose not merely from the fact that the most accessible and promising lands were there to be found, but was in accordance with a plan conceived by the governors of Canada and Nova Scotia for the establishing of a route of communication between Halifax and Quebec, and also to provide for the protection of the frontier. The details of the plan of settlement were embodied in the royal instructions issued to Governor Carleton, August 18, 1784. Section 55 of this important document reads:

And whereas we are desirous of testifying our entire approbation of the loyalty, sufferings and services of the commissioned officers of our Provincial forces who have been reduced: It is therefore our will and pleasure that upon application of such of the said commissioned officers who shall be willing immediately to settle and improve lands in our said province, you do direct that warrants of survey and grants for the same be made out and given in the following proportions, that is to say for every Field Officer 1,000 acres, to every Captain 700 acres, to every Subaltern, Staff and Warrant officer 500 acres, exclusive of the number to which members of their families are entitled.

In the case of non-commissioned officers, as before stated, the grant was to be 200 acres; and in that of privates, 100 acres, exclusive of the number of acres to which the members of their families might be entitled. The section just quoted further provides:—

And in order to strengthen the proposed settlements in our said province, and that they may be in a state of security and defence, it is our will and pleasure that the allotments to be made to the non-commissioned officers and private men under our said instructions shall be, where the same is practicable, by Corps and as contiguous as may be to each other, and that the allotments made to the several commissioned officers under this our instruction shall be interspersed therein, that the same may be thereby united and in case of attack be defended by those who have been accustomed to bear arms and serve together.

An examination of the grants and

plans in the Crown Land office at Fredericton proves that the settlement of the disbanded corps was, as far as possible, conducted in accordance with the King's instructions.

Col. Benjamin Thompson's regiment, the King's American Dragoons, commanded by Major Daniel Murray, was disbanded at Prince William on the 10th of October, 1783. The township of Prince William received its name from the royal patron of the corps, afterwards King William IV. of England. It comprises a tract of land six miles square adjoining the north boundary of the old township of Sunbury on the west bank of the St. John. Capt. John Munro, of the King's Royal Regiment, who made a tour of the St. John river during the summer and autumn of 1783, speaking of the township of Prince William, says, 'This settlement goes on fast; it is exceeding good lands.'

Notwithstanding Capt. Munro's admiration of the settlement, many of the soldiers speedily abandoned it, as they did other settlements subsequently established on the river. As an instance (of which several similar ones are to be found in the records of the old county of Sunbury) Private Samuel Sullivan of the King's American Dragoons, four days after the formal disbanding of his regiment, sold his claim to lot No. 204 in the Township of Prince William, containing about 100 acres, his legal right by draft, to Reuben Chase for the sum of £2, and acknowledged himself satisfied.

After the stirring scenes of the tented field, the monotony of life in the back woods with its accompanying hardships and privation had little attraction for many of the men of the disbanded corps. Others were so broken down in health by wounds and exposure during the war as to be unfitted for the task of clearing land and cultivating the soil.

One great practical hindrance to the settlement of the country was needlessly created through the folly of laying out the soldiers' lots along the St. John and other rivers with a

frontage of only sixteen rods and a depth of over three miles. Those who became actual settlers, in process of time sold the rear half of their lands, as too remote to be worked with advantage, and increased the breadth of their farms by purchase from their neighbors.

In an account of a missionary tour in New Brunswick in the year 1805, Dr. James McGregor, a Presbyterian minister of Pictou, N. S., quaintly describes the evil consequences of surveying the soldiers' lots in the customary fashion. After ascending the Nashwaak river some fifteen miles, he arrived at Highland Settlement, the people of which were 'the remains of the 42d Regiment which the British Government had settled there at the conclusion of the revolutionary war in America.' 'I found,' says Dr. McGregor, 'that they had been miserably abused in their settlement. The officers got large lots of the best land; the men got lots all length and no breadth! The consequence was that one half of the men had to leave their lands and go and shift for themselves somewhere else. Their dispersion disabled them from obtaining a minister of the gospel, and left them as stray sheep in the wilderness. A few of them had turned Baptists and Methodists, but the best and worst of them continued Presbyterians.'

The King's Orange Rangers were stationed in Nova Scotia at the time of the peace. They were assigned lands at Quaco Head on the Bay of Fundy, as we have already noted.

The companies of the Royal Fencible Americans at Fort Howe received their grant at Passamaquoddy.

To the remainder of the loyal regiments was assigned a tract of land 'extending from the townships of Mauderville and Burton on both sides of the St. John river on the route to Canada as far as to accommodate the whole.'

In accordance with this general plan the New Jersey Volunteers had their grant of land at Scodowabs-

cook (near Burgoyne's ferry) in the parish of Kingsclear.

The Maryland Loyalists had a grant on the east side of the St. John, opposite Fredericton extending from Heron's (or Killarney) lake to the Nashwaak, and another grant at the Penniac (or Pennyhock) stream a short distance above the present town of Marysville.

A portion of the Prince of Wales' American regiment was settled on the east side of the St. John below the mouth of the Keswick.

Farther up the valley of the Keswick lay the grant to the New York Volunteers.

The Royal Guides and Pioneers had a grant east of the main river between the Keswick and the Coac.

The Queen's Rangers had extensive grants in the parish of Queensbury, which derived its name from that famous loyal corps. One of the grants was above Bear Island (23 miles from Fredericton) on the east side of the St. John; another above the Maductic Falls, in the parish of Southampton; and still another on the opposite side of the St. John, extending from the Maductic Falls to Eel river. The 1st and 2d DeLancey battalions received a grant on the west bank of the St. John, beginning at a point a short distance above the Meductic, or Eel river, and including in its limits the present parish of Woodstock.

These were the principal grants to the Loyalist corps, but there were many smaller ones, and it must also be borne in mind that numbers of the officers and men of the Provincial regiments secured grants on the lower portion of the river St. John and in other parts of the province. Lt. Col. Richard Hewlett* and others

* Col. Hewlett was a native of Hempstead, Queen's county, Long Island, N. Y.; and the officers and men of his battalion were almost without exception natives of the same county. On their arrival in New Brunswick they perpetuated the familiar names of Hempstead, Long Island and Queen's county in the land of their adoption.

of DeLancey's 3d Battallion, for example, obtained grants of land in Queens and Sunbury counties.

16.—*Conclusion.*

The arrival of such a multitude of new settlers was a source of anxiety to the Indians. Capt. Munro, ascending the river on his return to Quebec, in October, 1783, found 'the most part of the Indians were moving off to the eastward for fear of the number of provincial troops and settlers coming upon the river.'

Those of the old inhabitants who had covertly or openly sympathized with the rebellion also regarded the coming of the Loyalists with disfavor. Many of them, having neglected to obtain any legal title to their lands, were, in the words of Amos Botsford, 'seated on the bank of the river without leave or license, merely to get their living.' It must be admitted that the Loyalists were rather supercilious in their dealings with this class of the old inhabitants, but it is probable that they were actuated not so much by a consciousness of their own superiority in point of education and social standing as by a hearty dislike for those who had in any way identified themselves with their enemies during the Revolutionary war.* A fruitful source of strife and bitterness was found in the fact that a number of lots which at the close of the war were in possession of the old settlers, but to which they had not secured any proper title, were by order of Governor Parr numbered and drawn in the usual manner by the loyal refugees. When the latter tried to take possession of these lands, trouble naturally ensued. Governor Parr then gave directions that the improvements

should be valued and paid for by the refugees who drew them; 'Accordingly,' says Col. Tyng, 'we appointed two discreet persons on behalf of the Loyalists, and the old inhabitants chose two for themselves; when they went upon the business they very soon differed in their prices and nothing conclusive took place. It is I think very evident,' he continues, 'that the appraisers for the old inhabitants have been unreasonable in the value they have set upon some spots; I cannot conceive any improvements upon this river can be worth £5 10s. per acre besides the first cost or value of the land.'† Time softened the asperity; the old settlers and the new were gradually reconciled; their children intermarried, and bit by bit the old feuds were forgotten.

On their first arrival, the Loyalists in many instances received much personal kindness at the hands of the old inhabitants. Mrs. Mary Bradley, in her curious old autobiography printed at St. John in 1849, says,

After the conclusion of the American war, a great number from the States fled to this place . . . My heart was filled with pity and affection when I saw them in a strange land, without house or home, and many of them were sick and helpless. I often looked at them when they passed by in boats in rainy weather, and wished for them to call and refresh themselves, and was glad when they did so.

Mrs. Bradley was then living at Maugerville. She mentions the fact that during the winter one of the

†The letter from which the above is taken was written by Col. Tyng from his place at Gagetown, which he calls 'Prospect Farm,' to Jonathan Odell, March 9th, 1785. In the settlement of the Loyalists on the St. John river Col. Tyng's services were of great value.

The scornful appellation sometimes employed by the Loyalists in designating the old inhabitants as 'the bow and arrow breed' is said to have had its origin in the fact that during the war the settlers on the St. John had been unable to procure the usual supplies of powder and shot for hunting, and out of sheer necessity had recourse to the Indian mode of hunting with the bow and arrow, in which they had become quite expert.

* It is a well-known fact that a large majority of the old inhabitants on the river St. John sympathised with the Americans in the Revolutionary war. See Kidder's *Military Operations in Eastern Maine and Nova Scotia*; Murdoch's *Nova Scotia*; C. L. Hatheway's *history of New Brunswick*; Hannay's *Township of Maugerville*.

Loyalist families lived in a portion of her father's house. The boats to which she refers were the famous Durham boats, supplied by government to the Loyalists for the transportation of their few possessions to their several destinations.

The supervision of the Loyalists as they arrived at St John was entrusted by Governor Parr to Captain Gilfred Studholme, of the Royal Fencibles, who commanded the garrison at Fort Howe.

History has scarcely awarded to Studholme the meed of praise he fairly earned by the energy and ability with which he discharged the duties of a responsible and difficult position, not only during the progress of the war but after the establishment of peace. Even the names by which in his honor the two longest streets in the city of St. John were formerly known have long since been changed: Gilfred street is now known as Union street and Studholme street as Charlotte street.

During the year 1783, Major Studholme's time was fully occupied in attending to the immediate wants of the Loyalists as they arrived in the country. As superintendent of the board of directors of the 'Towns at the entrance of the River' it was his duty to attend to the distribution of town lots and to provide each grantee with 500 feet of rough boards and a certain quantity of shingles to assist in building a rude dwelling for shelter during the ensuing winter. In all, Major Studholme distributed in this way 1,664,110 feet of boards and 1,449,919 shingles. His account for furnishing lumber and erecting houses between the 1st day of June and the 31st December, 1783, amounted to £6,721 6s. 6d., which amount was allowed and paid him by government. By the end of September, 700 houses were nearly finished. Meanwhile the settlement of the Loyalists on the St. John river and at Passamaquoddy had been slowly progressing.

Studholme's duties at St. John required so much time and attention that the work elsewhere was mainly con-

ducted under the supervision of Lieut. Samuel Denny Street, also of the Royal Fencibles. It should be mentioned to the honor of this officer that, having a grant at Burton of 3,000 acres, he voluntarily surrendered 2,000 acres, together with a valuable property at St. John, for the immediate accommodation of the Loyalists, on the assurance of Governor Parr that after they were provided for an equal amount of land should be assigned him elsewhere. This promise, however, was lost sight of, and Lieut. Street was left to struggle through life with a family of ten sons and two daughters, with no better provision than his thousand acres, his subaltern's half-pay, and his own natural abilities—the latter, as the event proved, being his best capital.

On the completion of his labors at St. John, Major Studholme removed to his grant of land on the Kennebecasis, where he spent his declining years and was buried. A little grove of evergreens, crowning the highest point on the north side of the river near the village of Apohaqui, marks his last resting place. The exact location of the grave is unknown.

Year by year, as the 18th day of May comes round, the city of the Loyalists dons her holiday attire, the memory of her loyal founders is recalled and duly honored, whilst the flag of Britain floats from its staff in honor of the day. Our thoughts go back to that May morning a century and more ago when the good ship *Union*, with the same old flag streaming from the mast head, led up to the anchoring ground beneath the protecting guns of old Fort Howe the most notable fleet that had yet entered the harbor of Saint John. It was the hand of Gilfred Studholme that first welcomed the wearied exiles to these rocky shores; but to-day no head stone marks the lone grave where far from kith and kin the brave old soldier's ashes lie.

Utilitarians have soundly lectured the Loyalists on the folly they manifested at the Revolutionary period. Those who thus criticise too often

have the most vague and indefinite ideas regarding the position of the Loyalists, both at the beginning and during the progress of the conflict between Great Britain and her old colonies. If the writer has been able to remove some of the many misconceptions that have existed, he is amply rewarded for the time and labor he has expended in the investigation of the subject.

History itself has justified the attitude assumed by those who were exiled for their fealty to the mother land. The inhabitants of the British American provinces have secured, from time to time, the redress of many grievances by constitutional

means. The reforms achieved during the century past are varied and important, and the constitution of Canada to-day happily combines freedom of local government with loyal attachment to the throne.

All honor to the brave hearts that laid strong and deep the foundations of our own Canadian home—that steadfastly adhered to principle, ‘faithful alike to God and king.’ May it be written above their quiet graves:

*‘Nunc placida compostus pace
quiescit.’*

W. O. RAYMOND.

St. John, N. B., May 18, 1893.